

Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petitions of delegates from Locals Nos. 374, 444, 460, 470, and 504, and from George W. Dolan, Local No. 460, of Chicago, Ill., urging the carrying on by the Government of the work of deepening and broadening sounds and of the dredge work on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Petition of Elie H. Flory, of Broussard, La., praying that his claim for property confiscated during the Rebellion be referred to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of the Pioneer Life Insurance Co., of Fargo, N. Dak., and the Maryland Life Insurance Co., of Baltimore, protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against a duty on German books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of the Maryland Life Insurance Co., of Baltimore, and the Pioneer Life Insurance Co., of Fargo, N. Dak., protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association of America at Denver, Colo., protesting against a duty on bananas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. B. Thompson, of New Orleans, La., protesting against the Clarke cotton-future tax amendment to the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the National Civil Service Reform League, protesting against the clause in the tariff bill referring to appointment of agents and inspectors relative to income-tax work without having passed the civil-service examination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Scranton Life Insurance Co., of Scranton, Pa., protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Interstate Cotton and Crushers' Association, protesting against the duty on colored oleomargarine and against the prohibitive duty on cottonseed oil by the Austro-Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Watsonville and the Pajaro Valley, favoring the passage of the bill granting 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the ninth annual convention of California Branch, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, opposing any change in the so-called Reilly eight-hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Banana Buyers' Protective Association (Inc.), of New York City, protesting against a tariff on bananas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts: Petition of the harbor and land commissioners of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting that the policy of the United States with regard to the improvement of rivers and harbors be so extended that it will permit cooperation of the various States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the board of supervisors of Trinity County, Cal., favoring the reestablishment of the United States land office at Redding, as provided by H. R. 5490; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of sundry employees of the Treasury Department, asking for an increase in salary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of the Pioneer Life Insurance Co., of North Dakota, protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 21 merchants of Charlotte, Mich., protesting against certain provisions of the parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, protesting against certain provisions of the parcel post, and of H. P. Hathaway, against sending of "held for postage" cards; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Nelson-Madden consular bill (S. 134 and H. R. 1723); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the National German-American Alliance of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against a duty on German books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 30, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the part of the Journal be again read at the point where the tariff bill was taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

On motion of Mr. SIMMONS, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of H. R. 3321—

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to call attention to the fact (and I notice that that phraseology has been heretofore used in the Journal) that it was not on motion but that by unanimous consent the bill was taken up. I ask to have that correction made, for the reason that those of us on this side are quite willing that the bill shall always be taken up by unanimous consent, and that has been the request which the Senator from North Carolina has made day by day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That correction will be made, and with that correction, if there be no other, the Journal will stand approved as read.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the Journals covering the period of the consideration of the tariff bill be corrected to correspond to the correction that was made in the Journal this morning, showing that the tariff bill has been taken up by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That correction will be ordered, so as to show that the bill was taken up by unanimous consent, that being within the knowledge of the Chair.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2374) providing for the care of the Confederate Stockade Cemetery, Johnstons Island, in Sandusky Bay, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 90) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2715) to amend the military record of John P. Fitzgerald, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 91) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 2856) providing for the retirement of certain medical officers of the Army (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 2857) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Florine A. Albright; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2858) granting a pension to Phebe W. Chase; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2859) waiving the age limit for the appointment as assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps in the United States Navy in the case of M. B. Bransford; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS, ETC.

Mr. LEWIS. I introduce a joint resolution which I ask to have read and that it take the usual course.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury under certain conditions when established to withdraw Government deposits from certain institutions and to withdraw charters and to prevent further enjoyment of the same, was read the first time by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to have the joint resolution read at length?

Mr. LEWIS. I should like to have the joint resolution read at this time, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, under certain conditions when established, to withdraw Government deposits from certain institutions and to withdraw charters and to prevent further enjoyment of the same.

Whereas the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in his official capacity has proclaimed to the public by public expression that certain banks and banking institutions, existing by virtue of the laws of the United States, and doing business by favor of the laws of the United States, and exercising privileges by favor of the people of the United States, have banded themselves together in some form of arrangement and proceeded in execution of such arrangement to intimidate Congress and terrorize the citizens of the

United States through inciting fear of a panic; and in pursuance of their scheme have falsely depressed securities of the United States and discredited the bonds of the United States Government and placed them at dishonor before the world, all for the object of influencing legislation contrary to the popular will and to defeat the President of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people, and to force legislation along such lines as shall be profitable to the personal objects and purposes of such institutions; and

Whereas such course and conduct, if true as charged, is an offense against patriotism and in violation of the duty of such institutions, due to the citizens of America, to the prosperity of its people, and the honor of the Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized in all instances where he has evidence of such conduct on the part of any institution, corporation, association, or person, in combination with each other, in conjunction or separate, to duly cite before him the representative of such institutions or the agents or authorities of such institution or institutions, and, in due hearing, if the said fact be established to his satisfaction, he shall have the right and the privilege to publicly withdraw the Government deposits from such institution, corporation, or person, and make order prohibiting the said institution, corporation, association, or person from further enjoying any privileges or favors of the Treasury of the United States or of the public moneys of the people of the United States. Also, in cases and instances, in his judgment justified, he shall have the right and privilege by public order to withdraw the charters of the said institutions, wherever such charters are issued by or under the authority of the Department of the Secretary of the Treasury; and shall have authority and privilege to issue any other order and carry the same into effect, depriving the said institutions of any right or privilege by them or it enjoyed under the United States Treasury or the office of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That any order of the Secretary of the Treasury made in pursuance of the above authority shall be subject to revision by Congress, through its appropriate committees, in the regular form of legislation as the procedure of Congress permits.

Resolved further, That the order of the said Secretary of the Treasury, within the heretofore-named authority vested in him, shall go into effect immediately upon the making of the said order by the Secretary of the Treasury and remain in effect until the same shall either be reversed or modified by the Secretary of the Treasury or by Congress through its appropriate avenues provided for revision or reversal of any order or action of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, I suppose.

Mr. LEWIS. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia. His judgment of the propriety or appropriateness of the reference is better than my own.

I wish to announce that I will address the Senate on the joint resolution at a due and proper time.

Mr. GALLINGER. The resolving clause of the joint resolution manifestly ought to be changed, and if it is a concurrent resolution it also ought to be changed.

Mr. LEWIS. I accept the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and at a later time amendments will be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. All right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TAX ON OPIUM.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon, all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

BERLIN TREATY OF 1878.

Mr. PENROSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 143), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas it is reported that the Roumanian Government has failed to observe that article of the treaty of Berlin of 1878 which provides that religion shall be no bar to the rights and privileges of citizenship in Roumania; and

Whereas the failure of the Roumanian Government to observe the provisions of the Berlin treaty would be discriminatory as against the native Jews of Roumania, affecting them prejudicially in matters of employment and preferment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to inform the United States Senate whether any communication has been had with the Roumanian Government or the powers signatory to the treaty of Berlin in relation to the observance of said treaty or with respect to a naturalization convention between the United States and the Roumanian Government; and, if so, and no conclusions have been reached thereon, whether the United States has such interests with respect to said treaty and the operation thereof as to make further diplomatic negotiations desirable.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT (S. DOC. NO. 147).

Mr. JONES. I have here a copy of the permit granted to the International Power & Manufacturing Co., of Spokane, Wash., with reference to the use of public lands and lands in forest reserves in connection with water-power development. The terms of the permit have been prepared with very great care by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and they have agreed upon the terms of the permit. It shows to a great degree the policy of these two departments with ref-

erence to the use of forest lands and public lands in connection with water-power development. I consider this to be a very important matter, and I ask that it be printed in the Record and also that it be printed as a public document.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed as a document and also to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

FINAL PERMIT INVOLVING POWER.

[Act of Feb. 15, 1901 (31 Stat., 790). Regulations of Mar. 1, 1913.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Washington.

Applicant: International Power & Manufacturing Co., Spokane, Wash. Principal works: Dam and power plant.

Location: T₈. 39 and 40 N., R. 43 E., Willamette meridian, Washington, on Clark Fork or Pend d'Oreille River.

Purpose of occupation and use of public lands: Construction, operation, and maintenance of works for the generation, distribution, and use of electrical power.

Date of initiation of priority: July 22, 1913.

Date of initiation of valid rights as against other claimants: July 22, 1913.

AGREEMENT.

The International Power & Manufacturing Co., hereinafter called the permittee, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Washington, the office and principal place of business of said permittee being at Spokane, Wash., being the successor in interest of the Pend d'Oreille Development Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington and authorized by act of Congress approved February 25, 1907 (34 Stat., 931), extended by act of Congress May 20, 1912 (37 Stat., 115), to construct a dam across Clark Fork or Pend d'Oreille River, in the State of Washington, for the development of water power, electrical power, and for other purposes, which said dam was to be constructed, maintained, and operated in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 23, 1910 (36 Stat., 593), entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906; and the said permittee in accordance with the provisions of the said act of Congress approved June 23, 1910, has submitted, under date of June 3, 1912, to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army plans and specifications and maps showing the location of such dam and necessary works, and the said permittee having heretofore filed in the Department of the Interior an application, designated as Spokane 08319, and including the following-described map of location: Map of location of reservoir site and power plant, marked "Exhibit J1," bearing affidavit of M. H. Gerry, Jr., engineer, and certificate of International Power & Manufacturing Co., by Wilbur S. Yearsley, vice president, under corporate seal of said company, filed in the General Land Office, Washington, D. C., on July 22, 1913; and said permittee having filed an application in the Department of Agriculture, including a duplicate of said map of location, said applications filed in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, hereinafter called the final application, having been made for the purpose of obtaining permission to occupy and use certain lands under the jurisdiction of the said departments for the purposes of the act of Congress approved February 15, 1901 (31 Stat., 790), for the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain works, said lands and works being more particularly described in and located and shown by the final application, does hereby amend said final application to include this agreement, and, furthermore, does hereby covenant and agree, in consideration of and as a prerequisite to the giving of the permission applied for in the final application as thus amended, such permission being hereinafter called the permit, that the conditions of the permit, each and every one of which shall at all times be binding on the permittee, are as follows:

SECTION 1. The following terms, wherever used in this agreement, shall have the respective meanings in this section assigned to them:

(a) "Interior Department lands" means lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for the purposes of the act of Congress approved February 15, 1901 (31 Stat., 790), and "national forest lands" means lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture for said purposes.

(b) "Secretaries" means the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) "Power business" means the entire business of the applicant or permittee in the generation, distribution, and delivery of power by means of any one power system, together with all works and tangible property involved therein, including freeholds and leaseholds in real property.

(d) "Power system" means all interconnected plants and works for the generation, distribution, and delivery of power.

(e) "Power project" means a complete unit of power development, consisting of a power house, conduit or conduits conducting water thereto, all storage or diverting or fore-bay reservoirs used in connection therewith, the transmission line delivering power therefrom, any other miscellaneous structures used in connection with said unit or any part thereof, and all lands the occupancy and use of which are necessary or appropriate in the development of power in said unit.

(f) "Project works" means the physical structures of a power project.

(g) "Construction of the project works" means the actual construction of dams, water conduits, power houses, transmission lines, or some permanent structure necessary to the operation of the complete power project and does not include surveys or the building of roads and trails, or the clearing of reservoir sites or other lands to be occupied, or the performance of any work preliminary to the actual construction of the permanent project works.

(h) "Customer" means the purchaser of electric current for redistribution and sale.

(i) "Consumer" means the user of current at the point of its final conversion into light, heat, or power.

(j) "Nominal stream flow" means the sum of (a) the average of the values estimated for the mean natural flow for the two-month (calendar) minimum-flow period in each successive five-year cycle or major fraction thereof, and (b) the increase in such average due to artificial means other than the project works.

(k) "Project storage flow" means the estimated increase in nominal stream flow made practicable by the project works.

(l) "Available stream flow" means the sum of nominal stream flow and project storage flow.

(m) "Load factor" means the ratio of average power output to maximum power output.

(n) "Total capacity of the power site" means the power estimated to be available for transmission, and is determined as the continued product of (1) the factor 0.08; (2) the average effective head, in feet; (3) the available stream flow at the intake (in second-feet and in amount not to exceed the maximum hydraulic capacity of the project works); and (4) a factor, not less than the average load factor of the power system, representing the degree of practicable utilization of the available stream flow, and based on the extent of practicable fore-bay storage and the load factor of the power system.

Sec. 2. The permit shall be subject to and the permittee shall be governed by the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 15, 1901 (31 Stat., 790), and to the regulations thereunder fixed by the Secretaries.

Sec. 3. The permit shall relate solely to the occupancy and use of the Interior Department lands and national forest lands necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such works contemplated by the act of Congress approved February 15, 1901 (31 Stat., 790), as are described in the final application, to the extent of the ground occupied by such works and not to exceed 50 feet on each side of the marginal limits of works other than pipe lines and electrical transmission lines and not to exceed 50 feet on each side of the center of each pipe line or electrical transmission line, in conformity with the location of such works on said lands as shown by the maps of location hereinbefore described.

Sec. 4. The permittee shall construct the project works on the location shown upon and in accordance with said maps and plans submitted with the final application, and shall make no material deviation from said location unless and until maps and plans showing such deviation shall have been submitted and approved by the Secretaries.

Sec. 5. Any approval of any alteration or amendment, or of any map or plan, or of any extension of time, shall affect only the portions specifically covered by such approval; and no approval of any such alteration, amendment, or extension shall operate to alter or amend, or in any way whatsoever be a waiver of any other part, condition, or provision of the permit.

Sec. 6. The permittee shall begin the construction of the project works and of the several parts thereof and shall thereafter diligently and continuously prosecute such construction to completion, unless temporarily interrupted by climatic conditions or by some special or peculiar cause beyond the control of the permittee, within the respective periods, dating from the issuance of the permit, specified for such beginning and for such completion in the following schedule:

1. Project works as a whole, excepting installation of hydraulic and electric machinery, shall be begun within one year and completed within three years.

2. Installation of hydraulic and electric machinery: Machinery of 50,000 horsepower rated capacity shall be installed within three years; and additional machinery shall be installed as the conditions of the market will warrant or as the Secretaries or any duly authorized State agency may direct.

Sec. 7. The permittee shall, after their completion, operate the project works continuously for the development and transmission of electric energy for sale or other disposal, unless upon a full and satisfactory showing that such operation is prevented by unavoidable accidents or contingencies this requirement is temporarily waived by the written consent of the Secretaries.

Sec. 8. No compensation for the permission given will be required prior to the year 1923; but on or before the 1st day of February in each year, beginning with 1924, the permittee shall pay, by certified check to the order of the Secretary of the Interior, or in such other manner as the Secretaries may direct, an amount calculated from the total capacity of the power site at rates per horsepower per year, varying directly as the square of the average price for electric energy charged to customers and consumers of the permittee as determined in subsection (c) hereof and varying inversely as the square of the proportional development of the power site, as shown by the following table:

When the average price in cents per kilowatt hour charged by the permittee is as shown by this column.	If the percentage of development of power site is—						
	Over 90.	90 and over 80.	80 and over 70.	70 and over 60.	60 and over 50.	50 and over 40.	40 or less.
Then the rates of compensation to the United States per horsepower per year will be as shown below.							
0.2 and less.....	\$0.05	\$0.06	\$0.08	\$0.10	\$0.14	\$0.20	\$0.31
0.3 and over 0.2.....	.11	.14	.18	.23	.31	.45	.70
0.4 and over 0.3.....	.20	.25	.31	.41	.56	.80	1.25
0.5 and over 0.4.....	.31	.39	.49	.64	.87	1.25	1.95
0.6 and over 0.5.....	.45	.56	.70	.92	1.25	1.80	2.81
0.7 and over 0.6.....	.61	.76	.96	1.25	1.70	2.45	3.82
0.8 and over 0.7.....	.80	.99	1.25	1.63	2.22	3.20	5.00
0.9 and over 0.8.....	1.01	1.25	1.58	2.06	2.81	4.05	6.33
1.0 and over 0.9.....	1.25	1.54	1.95	2.55	3.47	5.00	7.81
1.2 and over 1.....	1.80	2.22	2.81	3.67	5.00	7.20	11.25
1.5 and over 1.2.....	2.81	3.47	4.40	5.74	7.82	11.25	17.60
2 and over 1.5.....	5.00	6.17	7.82	10.00	13.80	20.00	31.25
3 and over 2.....	11.25	13.87	17.58	22.95	31.25	45.00	70.40
4 and over 3.....	20.00	24.70	31.25	40.80	55.60	80.00	125.00
5 and over 4.....	31.25	38.60	48.80	63.80	86.80	125.00	250.00
6 and over 5.....	45.00	55.60	70.40	91.80	125.00	180.00	281.25

It is expressly understood and agreed, however, that—

(a) At any time not less than 10 years after the date for the first payment under this section or after the last revision of the rates of compensation the Secretaries may review such rates after application by or notice to the permittee and impose such new rates of compensation, under a rule which shall be uniform for all permittees under like conditions, as they may decide to be reasonable and proper: *Provided*, That such rates shall not be so increased as to result in reducing the margin of income (including appreciation in land values) from the project over proper, actual, and estimated expenses (including reasonable allowance for renewals and sinking-fund charges) to an amount which, in view of all the circumstances (including fair development expenses and working capital) and risks of the enterprise

(including obsolescence, inadequacy, and supersession), is unreasonably small; but the burden of proving such unreasonableness shall rest upon the permittee.

(b) For the purposes of this section complete development of the power site shall mean the construction of such permanent project works and the installation of such generating equipment as will provide for the full utilization of the total capacity of the power site.

(c) The average price for electric energy charged to customers and consumers of the permittee shall be determined by dividing the total actual and estimated annual receipts from the sale and disposition of electric energy by the total number of kilowatt hours generated: *Provided*, That in determining said total annual receipts there shall be included estimated receipts for any electric energy used by the permittee at a price which shall not be less than 2 cents per kilowatt hour, nor less than the cost per kilowatt hour of generating, transmitting, and delivering such energy to the point of use, taking into account proper operating and maintenance expenses, fixed charges and reasonable allowances for renewals and sinking fund: *And provided further*, That if the permittee shall sell or dispose of electric energy to any consumer, said consumer being an association or corporation which the permittee owns or controls in whole or in part, or in which the permittee may have, hold, or control any interest, direct or indirect, by stock ownership or otherwise, the sale price per kilowatt hour at which the aforesaid annual receipts from such energy so sold or disposed of shall be computed shall not be less than as herein provided for in the computation of estimated receipts for energy used by the permittee: *And provided further*, That if the permittee shall sell or dispose of electric energy to any customer, said customer being an association or corporation which the permittee owns or controls in whole or in part, or in which the permittee may have, hold, or control any interest, direct or indirect, by stock ownership or otherwise, the sale price per kilowatt hour at which the aforesaid annual receipts from such energy so sold or disposed of shall be computed shall not be less than the price paid for such energy by the consumers thereof, nor less than as herein provided for in the computation of estimated receipts for energy used by the permittee.

(d) Unless otherwise authorized by the Secretaries, the maximum price at which electric energy developed by or transmitted from the power project may be disposed of to customers or consumers shall not exceed 6 cents per kilowatt hour, and the maximum price at which such electric energy in excess of 2,000 kilowatt hours per annum with an average annual delivery of more than 35 per cent of the connected installation within the year may be disposed of to customers or consumers shall not exceed 2 cents per kilowatt hour, said maximum price being determined by dividing the total annual charge to the purchaser by the corresponding total annual delivery to him of electric energy. In contracts with its customers the permittee shall specify the maximum price of final sale or resale and shall reserve the right to cancel any contract or agreement for sale or resale of electric energy that provides for a price in excess of such maximum. Complaint by any customer or consumer of a price paid by him in excess of such maximum price will be received by the Secretaries in case of and after the failure of his attempts to obtain satisfaction from the permittee or other parties selling electric energy under the power system, and thereupon, after notice to all interested parties, with opportunity for hearing, the Secretaries will determine whether this condition has been violated.

(e) The permittee shall at no time contract for the delivery to any one customer of electric energy in excess of 50 per cent of the total deliverable capacity of the power site; nor shall the permittee deliver to any customer or consumer for use in its own manufacturing or other operations any amount of energy in excess of 50 per cent of said deliverable capacity if and when there are pending unfilled applications for energy from other customers or consumers.

Sec. 9. The total capacity of the power site shall be deemed and taken to be 112,000 horsepower.

It is expressly understood and agreed, however, that said total capacity of the power site may be adjusted by the Secretaries annually to provide for increase or decrease, by storage or otherwise, of available stream flow to an amount of 10 per cent or more, or for increase or decrease of 10 per cent or more in average effective head, or in degree of practicable utilization, and that the decision of the Secretaries shall be final as to all matters of fact upon which the calculation of the capacity or compensation depends.

Sec. 10. The permittee shall pay the full value as fixed by the Secretaries for all timber cut, injured, or destroyed on Interior Department lands and on national forest lands in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the project works.

Sec. 11. The permittee shall pay the United States full value for all damages to the lands or other property of the United States resulting from the breaking of or the overflowing, leaking, or seeping of water from the project works, and for all other damage to the lands or other property of the United States caused by the neglect of the permittee or of the employees, contractors, or employees of the contractors of the permittee.

Sec. 12. The permittee shall install at such places and maintain in good operating condition in such manner as shall be approved or required by the Secretaries accurate meters, measuring weirs, gauges, or other devices approved by the Secretaries and adequate for the determination of the amount of electric energy generated by the project works and delivered under the power system and of the flow of the stream or streams from which the water is to be diverted for the operation of the project works and of the amount of water used in the operation of the project works and of the amounts of water held in and drawn from storage; and shall keep accurate and sufficient records of the foregoing determinations to the satisfaction of the Secretaries; and shall make a return during January of each year under oath of such of the records of measurements for the year ended on December 31 preceding made by or in the possession of the permittee as may be required by the Secretaries.

Sec. 13. The books and records of the permittee shall be open at all times to the inspection and examination of the Secretaries or other officer or agent of the United States duly authorized to make such inspection and examination.

Sec. 14. On demand of the Secretaries the permittee shall install a system of accounting for the entire power business in such form as the Secretaries may prescribe, which system, as far as is practicable, will be uniform for all permittees, and shall render annually such reports of its power business as the Secretaries may direct: *Provided, however*, That if the laws of the State in which the power business or any part thereof is transacted require periodical reports from public utility corporations under a uniform system of accounting, copies of such reports so made will be accepted as fulfilling the requirements of this clause in so far as they contain the information that may be required by the Secretaries.

SEC. 15. The permittee shall protect all Government and other telephone, telegraph, and power transmission lines at crossings of and at all places of proximity to the permittee's transmission lines in a workmanlike manner, according to the usual standards of safety for construction, operation, and maintenance in such cases, and shall maintain the transmission lines of the project in such manner as not to menace life or property.

SEC. 16. The permittee shall clear and keep clear the Interior Department lands and national forest lands along the transmission lines for such width and in such manner as the officer of the United States having supervision of such lands may direct.

SEC. 17. The permittee shall dispose of all brush, refuse, or unused timber on Interior Department lands and national forest lands resulting from the construction and maintenance of the project works to the satisfaction of the officer last aforesaid.

SEC. 18. The permittee shall build and repair such roads and trails as may be destroyed or injured by construction work or flooding under the permit, and shall build and maintain necessary and suitable crossings for all roads and trails that intersect the water conduit constructed, maintained, or operated under the permit.

SEC. 19. The permittee shall do everything reasonably within the power of the permittee, both independently and on request of the Secretaries or other duly authorized officers or agents of the United States to prevent and suppress fires on or near the lands to be occupied under the permit.

SEC. 20. The permittee shall indemnify the United States against any liability for damages to life or property arising from the occupancy or use of Interior Department lands and national forest lands by the permittee.

SEC. 21. The permittee shall sell power to the United States, when requested, at as low a price as is given to any other purchaser for a like use at the same time, and under similar conditions, if the permittee can furnish the same to the United States without diminishing the quantity of power sold before such request to any other customer by a binding contract of sale: *Provided*, That nothing in this clause shall be construed to require the permittee to increase permanent works or install additional generating machinery.

SEC. 22. The permittee shall abide by such reasonable regulation of the service rendered and to be rendered by the permittee to consumers of power furnished or transmitted by the permittee, and of prices to be paid therefor as may from time to time be prescribed by the State or any designated agency of the State in which the service is rendered: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section any such regulation shall be deemed to be suspended pending proceedings in the courts of such State, or in the Supreme Court of the United States on appeal from said State courts where such proceedings are in the nature of an appeal taken direct from the officer, commission, or board prescribing such regulation to said State courts: *And provided further*, That in the absence of regulation of service and prescribing of prices by any State agency, jurisdiction in the premises will, in their discretion, be exercised by the Secretaries.

SEC. 23. Upon demand in writing by the Secretaries to surrender the permit to the United States or to transfer the same to such State or municipal corporation as the Secretaries may designate, and to give, grant, bargain, sell, and transfer with the permit all works, equipment, structures, and property then owned or held by the permittee on lands of the United States occupied or used under the permit and then valuable or serviceable in the generation, transmission, and distribution of power: *Provided*, (a) That such surrender or transfer shall not be demanded in the case of a municipal corporation unless by condemnation such corporation shall have acquired, or unless by proceedings in a court of competent jurisdiction it shall have been determined that such a municipal corporation has the right to acquire the property of the permittee situated elsewhere than on public land, or unless such municipal corporation has the power to acquire the property and rights of the permittee in accordance with the following conditions: (b) That such surrender or transfer shall be on condition precedent that the United States shall pay or the transferee shall first pay to the permittee the reasonable value of all such works, equipment, structures, and property to be surrendered or transferred; (c) that such reasonable value shall not include any sum for any permit, right, franchise, or property granted by any public authority in excess of the sum paid to such public authority as a purchase price therefor; and (d) that such reasonable value shall be determined by mutual agreement of the parties in interest, and in case they can not agree, by the Secretaries, under a rule which, except as modified by the requirements of this section, shall be the then existing rule of valuation for power properties in condemnation proceedings in the State in which the properties to be surrendered or transferred are located. But nothing herein shall prevent the United States or any State or municipal corporation from acquiring by any other lawful means the permit or the works, equipment, structures, or property then owned or held by the permittee on lands of the United States occupied or used under the permit.

SEC. 24. In respect to the regulation, by any competent public authority, of the services to be rendered by the permittee or of the prices to be charged therefor, and in respect to any purchase or taking over of the properties or business of the permittee, or any part thereof, by the United States or by any State within which the works are situated or business is carried on in whole or in part, or by any municipal corporation in such State, no value whatsoever shall at any time be assigned to or claimed for the permit or for the occupancy or use of Interior Department lands or national forest lands thereunder, nor shall the permit or such occupancy or use ever be estimated or considered as property upon which the permittee shall be entitled to earn or receive any return, income, price, or compensation whatsoever.

SEC. 25. The works to be constructed, maintained, and operated under the permit shall not be owned, leased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device or in any manner so that they form part of, or in any way effect any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, or form the subject of any unlawful contract or conspiracy to limit the output of electric energy, or in restraint of trade with foreign nations or between two or more States, or within any one State, in the generation, sale, or distribution of electric energy. Except as in this agreement specifically provided, the permittee shall not agree or arrange in any manner whatsoever with any other party generating or disposing of electric energy with a view to the avoidance of competition or the fixing, maintenance, or increase of prices for electric energy or service.

SEC. 26. This permit shall be indeterminate as to time during compliance with the conditions of this agreement by the permittee, or until the United States or any State or municipal corporation shall exercise its option to purchase as provided in section 23. It is expressly understood and agreed, however, that the permit may be revoked by the Sec-

retaries, after due notice to the permittee, with opportunity for hearing, on a finding by them that any part of the amounts due for the compensation or the charges herein provided for, after due notice has been given, are in arrears for six months; or on a finding by the Secretaries that any of the provisions of this agreement or any of the regulations of the Secretaries or the provisions of the act of Congress to which the permit is subject as provided in section 2 hereof have been violated by the permittee.

It is further understood and agreed that under the terms of said act of Congress "any permission given by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act may be revoked by him or by his successor in his discretion."

It is further understood and agreed that at intervals of not less than 20 years, on application of the permittee or on demand of the Secretaries, this agreement and the permit shall be modified to conform to the then subsisting regulations fixed by the Secretaries under said act of February 15, 1901, or amendments thereto.

SEC. 27. The permittee shall, in the exercise of the permission given by the permit, at all times conform to and abide by such rules and regulations subserving the purpose of any reserved lands of the United States through which right of way is sought as may be prescribed by the officer having jurisdiction over such lands.

SEC. 28. The permit does not affect the rights to the occupancy of lands granted by the State of Washington or any rights, privileges, or franchises conferred upon the permittee by virtue of the act of Congress approved February 25, 1907 (34 Stat., 931), as amended by the act of Congress approved May 20, 1912 (37 Stat., 115), entitled "An act to extend the time for the construction of a dam across the Pend d'Oreille River, Wash.," or impair or affect the rights conferred upon the said permittee by compliance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 23, 1910 (36 Stat., 593), entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters."

SEC. 29. On proper application by the permittee under subsisting regulations fixed by the Secretaries, the permit may be amended to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional project works and the use of additional rights of way for the power project. Any application for such amendment and approval thereof shall be in the form of a supplemental agreement and permit so drawn as to become a part of the original agreement and permit.

SEC. 30. The permit and the right of way thereby afforded shall be subject to all prior valid rights and to a reservation of right of way for canals or ditches constructed by authority of the United States.

In witness whereof the permittee has caused these presents to be executed, in triplicate, by its vice president and agent and its corporate seal to be hereto affixed by its vice president, both thereunto duly authorized, this 28th day of July, 1913.

[SEAL.] INTERNATIONAL POWER & MANUFACTURING CO.,
By WILBUR S. YEARSLEY, Vice President.

Attest:
N. S. COMBS, JR.
M. T. BUNCH.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss:

On this 28th day of July, 1913, before me, a notary public in and for said county, duly commissioned and sworn, my commission expiring November 6, 1913, personally came Wilbur S. Yearsley, to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he resides in Spokane, Wash.; that he is the vice president of the International Power & Manufacturing Co.; that said company is the corporation that is described in and that executed the foregoing agreement; that he knows the seal of said corporation; that the seal affixed to the foregoing agreement is such corporate seal and was affixed to such instrument by order of the board of directors of said corporation; and that he signed his name thereto by like order; and the said Wilbur S. Yearsley acknowledged the foregoing agreement to be the free act and deed of said corporation.

Witness my hand and official seal the day and year first hereinbefore written.

[NOTARIAL SEAL.] E. C. OWEN, Notary Public.
My commission expires November 6, 1913.

PERMIT.

In pursuance of the act of Congress approved February 15, 1901 (c. 372; 31 Stat., 790), and in pursuance of the general regulations thereunder fixed, respectively, by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and in consideration of the conditions made and accepted in the foregoing agreement, permission to use the right of way through the public lands and reservations of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, sought by and described in the application identified in the foregoing agreement, is hereby given to the said International Power & Manufacturing Co., subject, however, to the said general regulations and to the conditions in said agreement, such permission, subject to such regulations and conditions, having been found by us to be not incompatible with the public interest.

In witness whereof we have subscribed these presents, in triplicate, on this 29th day of July, 1913.

ANDRIEUS A. JONES,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.
D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO (S. DOC. NO. 148).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution adopted by the Senate on April 24, 1913, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State.

By the resolution mentioned the President was requested "if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause to be transmitted to the Senate—

"First, A full list of the names of claimants, if any, and the nature and amount of the claims for damages to person or prop-

erty made by citizens of the United States of America against the Republic of Mexico and filed or deposited with the Department of State at Washington, D. C., since the beginning of the Madero revolution in Mexico to the present time, together with the statement of fact on which said claims are based.

"Second. A full list of the names of all citizens of these United States, if any, who while leading lawful and peaceful lives in Mexico have been killed or wounded in Mexico or driven out of Mexico by Mexican soldiers or other armed bands on Mexican soil, together with the facts and circumstances attending such killing, wounding, or forceful deportation.

"Third. A full list, if any, of such peaceful citizens of the United States of America as have been forcibly seized and held prisoners for ransom in the Republic of Mexico during the time first mentioned, and what sums of money, if any, have been paid by any person or persons to secure the release of anyone so imprisoned or held.

"Fourth. What redress, if any, has been offered by Mexico in the premises, or demanded by the United States of America, and the result of such offer or demand, and what assurance of protection to the lives and property of our peaceful, law-abiding citizens in Mexico does that Republic offer."

I concur in the opinion of the Secretary of State that it would not be compatible with the public interest to transmit to the Senate at this time the lists and information requested by the resolution.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 30, 1913.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do I understand that the morning business is closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further routine business, the morning business is closed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, as we are now frankly told by those in charge of the pending bill that it rejects the "cost of production theory," I want to call the attention of those Senators who intend to vote for it to the fact that the Democratic Party is doing precisely what it promised not to do to the people of Connecticut and New England.

I have for many years hoped that the Democratic Party would some time adopt a tariff plank that would not be susceptible of two or more interpretations, because it has been my belief that if the Democratic Party would do this, very great benefits would result to the people of this country. It would improve the moral and mental tone of all the political parties if they would as far as possible avoid uncertainty of intent in their platform declarations, and I have always been glad that in this most important of all issues—the tariff issue—the Republican Party has had the courage of its convictions before as well as after election. And I regret that the Democratic Party has always found it necessary to deceive itself and a large percentage of the people of the United States upon this all-important question. And early in the debate upon this measure I want to put the proof of this statement where it can be read by every Senator who thinks he is obliged to vote for this bill because he is a Democrat. I think I can easily satisfy every fair-minded Member of this body that this bill is a complete betrayal of the people of Connecticut and New England, for I shall bring none but the very highest Democratic authority to my support.

In Connecticut, as the campaign advanced, the tariff soon became the only issue of real consequence, barring the personality of Mr. Roosevelt, who soon allayed the fears of his friends by standing pat for protection. Many Republicans voted for Mr. Roosevelt because of his opposition to Mr. Taft's low-tariff ideas as expressed in his defense of reciprocity with Canada. Other Republicans, fearing the popularity of Mr. Roosevelt and bitterly opposing his views upon other questions than the tariff, in order to make his defeat certain voted for Mr. Wilson. President Wilson many times during the campaign alluded to the tariff question, but his treatment of the subject was in the abstract only. His generalities did not glitter; things glitter by reflected light. President Wilson's generalities shone of their own inherent radioactive energy, but in their brightest rays we find nothing for or against free sugar or free wool or any one of the rates applied to the 4,000 items in this bill.

When Mr. UNDERWOOD, the author of the pending bill, came to Connecticut, he knew why he came, and when he met ex-Congressman Hill in joint debate at Waterbury the only subject

mentioned was the tariff, and Mr. UNDERWOOD knew why. Mr. Hill was rapidly succeeding in convincing the mechanics of Connecticut that the tariff rates proposed and to be proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD would compel a reduction of wages, and Mr. UNDERWOOD was sent for to allay the fears of the doubtful. It was an important meeting. Stenographers from all over the State were there. In my opinion the electoral vote of Connecticut and the election of five Congressmen depended upon Mr. UNDERWOOD's tariff views as expressed that night. Mr. Hill opened the debate, and he gave his hearers Mr. UNDERWOOD's record and quoted Mr. UNDERWOOD's theories upon the tariff question and charged him with being in favor of a tariff for revenue only. Mr. UNDERWOOD took no chances. He admitted that he believed in the theory of a tariff for revenue only, "but"—and, as is the custom with Democratic orators in the North, he put great emphasis on that "but"—and then went on to explain that the expenses of the Government must be paid and legitimate industries must not be disturbed. Mr. Hill had argued for a tariff equaling the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. And now I want to quote Mr. UNDERWOOD's reply as taken by a stenographer on the spot and published in the leading Democratic newspaper of Connecticut on the following day:

EXTRACT FROM MR. UNDERWOOD'S SPEECH AT WATERBURY, CONN., OCTOBER 16, 1912, AS PRINTED IN THE HARTFORD TIMES.

Now let us see where the difference between these two great parties is. He—Mr. Hill—says we are a free-trade party. I deny it. There is a clean distinction. Whenever you cut off competition then you are damming back revenue, and your tariff is levied for the purpose of protecting somebody's profit, and not for the purpose of getting revenue for the Government. When you equalize exactly the difference in cost at home and abroad, if you can do it—it is impossible to do it exactly, but you may approximate it—but when you do that you have got a competitive tariff because each can come in the same field and fight for control of the market. And from that on down to 1 cent, the lowest tax you could levy, it is a competitive field, and it is a revenue field. It is a field in which you can collect a revenue tariff, because all below, after fixing the exact difference of cost at home and abroad on downward, is a revenue tariff. Now, what I said at the meeting at Hartford was that that being the case, and the Government needing all the revenue it could get—we have got to have it—we had to levy the taxes at the highest revenue rate consistent with our principles, which, of course, can not go above the difference of cost at home and abroad, because then you would be protecting profit; we have got to levy it somewhere near there in order to get a revenue to run the Government.

And again, before he closed his speech, he said:

Now, there are two sides to this question. There isn't a particle of possibility of the Democratic Party that it won't equalize the difference in labor cost at home and abroad.

Mr. President, this is what the people of Connecticut were promised by the man on the Democratic tariff throne, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee then and now, the man whose word was then and would be the law for this great Nation upon that most vital of questions. Let me repeat the last sentence:

"There isn't a particle of possibility of the Democratic Party that it won't equalize the difference in the labor cost at home and abroad." In other words, I will do precisely what Mr. Hill tells you he will do if he is reelected.

This interpretation of the Democratic platform by Mr. UNDERWOOD, and this promise made by Mr. UNDERWOOD was heartily approved by the Democratic candidates for Congress in Connecticut, as I will show before I close. Mr. Hill was defeated, as were all the Republican nominees in the State. In Connecticut certainly the author of this bill did not reject "the cost of production theory."

I have said that President Wilson's ante-election interpretation of his party's tariff plank was faultless and was hailed by the Democratic press of Connecticut as indicating the highest degree of statesmanship and the deepest concern for the industrial interests of the State. In passing let me quote the part which was supposed to silence every Republican tongue and put the troubled Democratic heart at rest.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT WILSON'S SPEECH AT NEW YORK, OCTOBER 29, 1912, AND PUBLISHED IN THE HARTFORD TIMES.

The Republicans are telling you—both branches of them—that if this wild-eyed schoolmaster becomes President we shall have free trade. Gov. Wilson does not sufficiently define his position on the tariff. The only thing they have to do to know Gov. Wilson's position on the tariff is to read and comprehend the English language. I have defined my position so often that as I have told these gentlemen of the press who go around with me wherever I go to see that I do not get into mischief, that I am ashamed to tell again in their presence what my position is on the tariff. Well, for fear there are persons present who can not read the English language or who have just moved into the United States and never heard anything about this subject, I am going to define my position on the tariff. And here we have it as follows:

No thoughtful Democrat in the United States has so much as even proposed free trade. But every Democrat in the United States who knows anything knows that the schedules of the tariff almost from end to end conceal special privileges and private favors, which we are going to cut out without touching or endangering one single wholesome fiber or honest arrangement. Is that definite enough? Do you not suppose that Democrats live in the United States? Do you suppose

that Democrats have come to the conclusion that they had better pull the house down about their own ears? Are they so rich that they can now afford to retire from business? Are they going to commit economic suicide? Do they look like tyros and innocents and beginners?

I will refer this interpretation of the Democratic platform to the Senators from Louisiana, where it is admitted by Democrats even that legitimate industries are to be destroyed. I refer to it myself to show that the candidate for the Presidency was careful to take nothing from the strength of Mr. UNDERWOOD's clean-cut promise to make good the difference in the cost of production.

On October 19, 1912, the Hon. THOMAS L. REILLY, then the only Democratic Congressman from Connecticut, taking his cue from Mr. UNDERWOOD's speech in Waterbury, reaffirmed and repeated Mr. UNDERWOOD's promise to the people of Connecticut in the following language:

EXTRACT FROM CONGRESSMAN REILLY'S SPEECH AS PUBLISHED IN THE WATERBURY AMERICAN, OCTOBER 19, 1912.

They say that no tariff should be enacted to protect anybody. The Democratic theory is that the American manufacturer should be given a fair chance with foreign manufacturers, and that the tariff should be used to equalize the cost of production here and abroad.

It is a pity that Congressman REILLY and the Finance Committee of the Senate could not have compared notes before election.

And the Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, Democratic governor of Connecticut and candidate for President of the United States in the convention that nominated President Wilson, added his name and seal to the sacred promise—for all Democratic promises are sacred when made—in the following language:

EXTRACT FROM GOV. BALDWIN'S SPEECH AT NORWICH, CONN., OCTOBER 17, 1912, AS PUBLISHED IN THE WATERBURY AMERICAN ON OCTOBER 18, 1912.

The Democratic Party proposes in the next Congress to revise the tariff, but not in a radical way. They are not aiming at free trade. We mean to have a larger free list, and duties high enough to enable us to keep on paying the highest wages in the world, without unnecessarily raising the cost of living to every American family.

On the 30th of October, 1912, there was a great Democratic demonstration in the city of New Britain, Conn. This city is the center of the cutlery and hardware interests of the State. The speaker for the occasion was the Hon. William C. Redfield, now the Secretary of Commerce, in Mr. Wilson's Cabinet, the man who is to investigate and punish all those manufacturers who may be unable to perform the miracles required by this law. I ask the Senators who believe that their party is pledged to reject the "cost of production theory" to listen to the promise which their own Secretary of Commerce made to the people of New Britain, Conn. I quote from Secretary Redfield's speech as printed in the Hartford Times on October 31, 1912:

Finally, let not the boggy of what is called "free trade" scare sensible men longer. No one proposes it; it is known by those who cry aloud to be a false cry of wolf where there is no wolf. We must have revenue, and a very large part of that revenue must come from a tariff. There is no other way. The Democratic campaign is in the hands of thoughtful, experienced men of business, largely interested themselves in American manufactures, hoping for them to be prosperous and intending to open wide the door to a larger prosperity than we have ever known. They are not standing with axes ready to cut the rope that binds the ship of state to a safe anchorage. They are rather standing at the ropes which loosen the sails to a favoring wind that shall bring the ship of state into a safe and happy harbor.

These glittering gems of promise and poetry from Messrs. UNDERWOOD, REILLY, Baldwin, and Redfield, composed the message of Democracy to 35,911 spinners and weavers, 36,253 employees in the machinery plants, 16,817 in the brass and bronze factories, 37,763 in the foundry and machine shops, 5,217 hatters, and thousands of others in Connecticut.

Mr. President, Congressman UNDERWOOD, and Congressman REILLY, and Secretary Redfield, and Gov. Baldwin, and every Democratic candidate and newspaper in Connecticut promised to give the people of Connecticut precisely what Congressman HILL and every other Republican candidate promised, namely, "a tariff based upon the cost-of-production theory; i. e., the difference in the cost of production here and abroad."

Now let us come to Washington and consider the manner in which these promises have been kept. A few days ago the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of the Committee on Finance, in his concluding remarks made in explanation of the pending measure, used the following language:

For the reasons given by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, your committee has rejected the cost-of-production theory. The grounds upon which this theory was rejected are so conclusive and so exhaustively stated in the several reports of the House committee upon this subject that it is not deemed necessary to restate them here.

On page 12 of the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of 1913, to which we are referred by the Senator from North Carolina, we find this statement:

COST-OF-PRODUCTION THEORY REJECTED.

The so-called theory of cost of production as a regulator of rates was fully discussed at the time tariff-revision bills were introduced by

the Ways and Means Committee during the Sixty-second Congress. It will be recalled that much was said by protection advocates in support of the view that it was incumbent upon the United States to maintain a system of tariff rates that would cover differences in cost of production between the United States and foreign countries, in addition to a reasonable margin of profit. That doctrine became the basis of the work of the Tariff Board which furnished reports to the President, later transmitted by the Executive to Congress, concerning wool and woollens, cottons, pulp, and paper. Many manufacturers have presented arguments based on the doctrine of comparative costs. The statement is therefore made that no part of the committee's work has been founded upon a belief in the cost-of-production theory, and the theory is absolutely rejected as a guide to tariff making.

Let us now put the promise of the Democratic Party to the people of Connecticut and the manner in which it has been performed in parallel columns.

THE PROMISE.

UNDERWOOD'S promise, from his speech at Waterbury, Conn., October 17, 1912:

"Now let us see where the difference between these two great parties is. He says we are a free-trade party. I deny it. There is a clean distinction. A revenue tariff must be a competitive tariff. Whenever you cut off competition then you are damming back revenue, and your tariff is levied for the purpose of protecting somebody's profit, and not for the purpose of getting revenue for the Government. When you equalize exactly the difference in cost at home and abroad, if you can do it—it is impossible to do it exactly, but you may approximate it—but when you do that you have got a competitive tariff, because each can come in the same field and fight for control of the market. And from that on down to 1 cent, the lowest tax you could levy, it is a competitive field, and it is a revenue field. It is a field in which you can collect a revenue tariff, because all below, after fixing the exact difference of cost at home and abroad, on downward it is a revenue tariff. Now, what I said at the meeting at Hartford was that that being the case, and the Government needing all the revenue it could get—we have got to have it—we had to levy the taxes at the highest revenue rate consistent with our principles, which, of course, can not go above the difference of cost at home and abroad, because then you would be protecting profit; we have got to levy it somewhere near there in order to get a revenue to run the Government."

"Now, there are two sides to this question. There isn't a particle of possibility of the Democratic Party that it won't equalize the difference in labor cost at home and abroad."

The italics are mine.

Is it strange, Mr. President, that the Democratic Congressmen from Connecticut were not satisfied with the bill as it came from the Ways and Means Committee of the House? Is it strange that the Hon. JEREMIAH DONOVAN, the successor of the Hon. E. J. Hill, used the following language in the House of Representatives on May 3 last in his patriotic but unsuccessful efforts to persuade Mr. UNDERWOOD and his colleagues in the House of Representatives that it was his and their duty to deal with the industries of Connecticut as he, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and his party promised they would deal with them before election?

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. JEREMIAH DONOVAN IN OPPOSITION TO THE UNDERWOOD BILL, DELIVERED MAY 3, 1913.

I am probably representing a class of labor which, in my opinion, is treated more cruelly than any other class from beginning to end of this report of the Ways and Means Committee.

But I am going to claim, too, that if this matter had been considered at the beginning of the hearings there is no question as to what the result would have been. You will appreciate my point of view when I tell you that the distinguished chairman of this committee, though campaigning in a strange State, among a strange people, with the natural prejudices of those people against him and his associates in his section of the country, when he went amongst my people practically carried—yes, swept—the State from end to end with his eloquence. How? By the same means that he carries this body whenever he so desires—by his personality. When you think that misfortune or errors may befall you, you have only to look upon that face and you forget them all. [Laughter and applause.]

Unfortunately, I am occupying a position here formerly filled by one of the most noted men of our country. Probably no man ever came out of that State so well known, either favorably or unfavorably [laughter] as my predecessor. At home he said to his people since the election and within a few days that I am a free trader. The distinguished gentleman who is chairman of this committee says to his associates here in this body that the way I was returned and elected was that I accused Mr. Hill of being a free trader. [Laughter.] But that is neither here nor there. This can not affect our people,

The personality of the gentleman from Alabama is what made our people politically go with him. On the 13th day of March of this year he repeated at the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, in yonder office building, what he said to them in Connecticut. This is in his report as chairman, volume 4, page 3861: "Of course," says the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, "of course none is in favor of reducing the tariff if it is going to injure any American industry." That was on the 13th day of March. [Applause.]

The italics are mine.

The five Democratic Congressmen from Connecticut have done what they could to prevent this complete betrayal of the people of Connecticut, but to little or no purpose, and the reason must be plain to everyone.

Mr. President, there are "protection" Democrats and there are "tariff-for-revenue-only" Democrats, and when you try to mix them they will not mix, because they can not be mixed. This fact has been and will be the tragedy of Democracy, if not of the Nation, until something or somebody comes to the rescue.

A week before election President Wilson told the people of the country that the only thing they have to do to know his position on the tariff is to read and comprehend the English language. Now, let us turn to the only language used by President Wilson upon the tariff question which I have been able to find which can be read and comprehended without difficulty. I quote from his address before the tariff commission at Atlanta in 1883 as follows:

Protection also hinders commerce immensely. The English people do not send to this country as many goods as they would if the duties were not so much, and we are building up manufactures here at the expense of commerce. We are holding ourselves aloof from foreign countries in effect and saying, "We are sufficient to ourselves; we wish to trade not with England but with each other." I maintain that it is not only a pernicious but a corrupt system.

Replying to the question of Commissioner Garland, "Are you advocating the repeal of all tariff laws?" Prof. Wilson answered:

Of all protective tariff laws; of establishing a tariff for revenue merely. It seems to me very absurd to maintain that we shall have free trade between different portions of this country and at the same time shut ourselves out from free communication with other producing countries of the world. If it is necessary to impose restrictive duties on goods brought from abroad it would seem to me, as a matter of logic, necessary to impose similar restrictions on goods taken from one State of this Union to another. That follows as a necessary consequence; there is no escape from it.

So to-day we find the Democratic Party led, and I may say gently but irresistibly pushed, by President Wilson into the adoption of his views when so expressed that they can be understood. As a result, the "protection" Democrats in the Senate have agreed to a bill which they hope will not violate their views; and the "tariff-for-revenue-only" Senators have agreed to a bill which they hope will not violate their views. It must be very clear that, inasmuch as the days of miracles have passed, somebody on the other side of this Chamber is mistaken.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and other Senators upon this side of the Chamber have indicated very clearly, I think, where the mistake lies. The "protection" Democrats have tried to compromise with the "free-trade" Democrats, and this, of course, is impossible. You can not compromise with the arithmetic or the compass. You are either there or you are not there. If 20 per cent does not protect, 10 per cent will not protect. My complaint is that the Democratic Party has broken its sacred promise to the people of Connecticut. This I have shown from the lips of those Democrats who alone had authority to do the promising. If adequate protection is found in any rate contained in this bill, it is there by accident only. A tariff which rejects the "cost-of-production theory" can not give protection except by accident. You can not intentionally give protection without taking into consideration the cost of production. You can not revise the tariff and not destroy legitimate industries unless you take into consideration the cost of production. Therefore, if any legitimate industry escapes the paranoiac assaults in this bill it will be an accidental escape. It may be that some industries of my State and the country will survive the effect of the Democratic brain storm contained within the eight corners of this bill. I sincerely hope so. Two woolen mills in Connecticut are already in serious trouble. The management of the more important one—the Yantic Mills—assigns the following as the cause:

Had it not been for the unsettled business conditions in our trade, owing to the proposed tariff legislation, we would never have gone into the hands of a receiver. The trade is at a standstill. We are getting only enough orders to produce one-third of our regular output. Our sales were close upon \$1,000,000 a year. Now they have fallen below \$400,000. Our fixed charges are so great that we can not continue to run with this limited production. Our firm is not an exception.

Is this a harbinger of Secretary Redfield's beautiful spring? I pray not, but if not it won't be the fault of this bill.

This bill has been described as a glaring example of invisible and inaudible government. It is not the way in which the conclusions of the committee have been reached; it is the effect of

these conclusions that the people of Connecticut are afraid of. This bill may be an example of "invisible" and, as the Senator from Iowa so aptly added the other day, "inaudible" government, but it is a sample of minority government in complete betrayal of the promises of that minority to the people of Connecticut that I object to.

It has been asserted here by those responsible for this measure that they are merely carrying out as in duty bound the mandate of a majority of the whole people.

In Connecticut, as I have shown, Mr. UNDERWOOD in person solicited instructions to reform the tariff upon "the cost of production theory," and he got what he asked for. Now the Democratic Party in Congress repudiates those instructions upon the ground that it received a mandate from the people to do what it proposes to do, which I can not name, because it is nameless.

What happened on election day besides the defeat of the Republican Party? 6,292,600 votes were cast for Mr. Wilson; 8,602,042 votes were cast against him—1,655,230 less than a majority for Mr. Wilson and his platform, attractive and safe as Mr. UNDERWOOD had tried to make it; 1,655,230 more votes were cast for the principle of protection than for the tariff plank of the Democratic platform, whatever it meant.

I will not go into the views of the great Democratic scholars as to the danger which surrounds a popular government where the vox Dei comes from the throat of a minority of the vox populi. It is too late to talk about that or lament it. The voice of the majority has surrendered to the voice of the plurality, and if I am ever converted to the "referendum" it will be for the reason that in no other way can the people meet a great issue like the tariff, face to face, and a majority put their seal upon it with a plain yes or no, uninterfered with by other issues or the personalities of candidates.

It may or it may not be just to claim that the people by a majority of 1,655,230 votes instructed their Representatives in Congress to maintain the principle of protection, but certainly there is no foundation for the assertion that a majority of the people voted for free sugar or free wool or a tariff for revenue only. Would it not be nearer the truth to say that not one in a million had any knowledge of the precise rates which the Ways and Means Committee would fix if controlled by the Democratic Party? Indeed, when you come to rates—and nothing else is of consequence—when you come to crystallize promises and theories into a choice between specific and ad valorem duties and their alternating equivalents to be written into the proposed law there was only one man in the United States who knew what he was voting for, and that man was Mr. UNDERWOOD. He might have known that a Democratic victory meant the placing of cotton dyes on the free list and wool dyes on the protected list; he might have known that goats' wool was to be taxed and sheep's wool was to be free; that elephants' tusks were to be taxed and cotton bands put on the free list. But if so he was the only man.

The President in his address to Congress said that it is a case of sharpening wits. I agree with him heartily, but shall we sharpen our wits by giving up the only tools with which wits can be sharpened? Is Uncle Sam to acquire the dexterity and endurance necessary to win in the pending international industrial struggle by exercising his voting and advisory powers only? What particular industries shall we abandon and what shall we retain? For what particular market shall we surrender our own? For what particular oriental rainbow shall we exchange our pot of gold in hand? We are told that we must concentrate upon industries which by the test of experience we can sustain. After a century of test we know of none such in our country. On the contrary we know that there are none. Indeed, we can not expect to retain our own market without protection.

We know that as water seeks its level so wages will tend to equality where the physical conditions are equal. Shall we help the situation now by adopting a fiscal system that will lower or endanger in any way our present standard of wages? If we expect to excel other nations in naval warfare, we must practice—practice naval architecture and maneuvers constantly, and all of this will be of no avail unless we practice shooting. So in the great struggle for industrial supremacy that to-day faces the nations of the earth, if we would win the victory in weaving and spinning, we must weave and spin constantly. If we would conquer in any single line of production we must put and keep our people upon an equal footing with foreign peoples, where we may fairly expect to overcome the obstacles in the way, physical or economic. But our people will not experiment at a loss and the Congress can not compel them to experiment at a loss. A man will practice singing for the pleasure of it. He may practice oratory for the fame of it. But if he practices manufacturing, he does it for the money there is in it and for no other reason, and the prices and

bounties and taxes that have been paid by the nations of the world to invite, incite, and excite the sharpest rivalry among men in their effort to subjugate and enlist in their behalf the hostile forces of nature have been the best investments that have been made up to date. And that, I think, Mr. President, is one of the reasons why every civilized nation on the earth except England has discovered the economic wisdom of protecting opportunity by protective tariffs, and why every nation on earth including England has offered bounties and prizes to those who have advanced civilization by increasing the productivity of human toil.

I desire at this time to put into the RECORD a partial list of the Connecticut industries which will be affected by the pending bill. This list I take from the last census and the Connecticut factory and labor bulletins.

Later on I may appeal to those responsible for this bill to raise certain rates which are clearly demanded, but my purpose at this time is to show that the pending bill is in its entirety founded upon a tariff theory which, in my opinion, excludes the possibility of intelligent protection to American industries and which is in glaring violation of the pledges of the Democratic Party to the people of Connecticut.

STATISTICS CONCERNING MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES OF CONNECTICUT. [From Abstract of Thirteenth Census, 1910.]

In 1910 Connecticut had a population of 1,114,756 and ranked twelfth among the States with regard to the value of her manufactured products. There were 4,251 manufacturing establishments, which gave employment to an average of 233,871 persons during that year. She paid out \$135,756,000 in salaries and wages. The value of manufactured products turned out was \$490,272,000, and the value of the materials used in the manufacture of these products was \$257,259,000, giving an added value by manufacture of \$233,013,000. The expenses were \$420,904,000, and the capital was \$517,547,000.

Connecticut ranks second among the States in the production of rubber boots and shoes, measured by the value of the products, and the three gold and silver refineries of the State reported a greater value of the products than did any other State.

Textile industries.—These industries in Connecticut gave employment to an average of 34,192 wage earners, or 16.2 per cent of the total of all the manufacturing industries in the State. The value of the products amounted to \$70,459,000, or 14.4 per cent of the total value of manufactured products. Of the total value of the products of the four branches of the textile industry, 34.4 per cent was contributed by the cotton mills, 29.9 per cent by the silk mills, 27.5 per cent by the woolen and worsted mills, and 8.2 per cent by the hosiery and knitting mills.

Brass and bronze products.—Connecticut ranked first among the States in the combined value, reporting 44.6 per cent of the total value for the United States.

Foundry and machine shops.—In the products of this industry the most important one consists of hardware, of which more than two-fifths of the total value reported for the United States was reported from Connecticut.

Firearms and ammunition.—This industry is mainly centralized in New Haven and Bridgeport, exclusive of governmental establishments. Almost four-fifths of the total value of ammunition and over one-fourth of the total value of firearms manufactured in the United States was reported from establishments located in the State. Connecticut was the leading State in the total value of products reported for the combined value.

Automobiles and parts.—This includes 8 establishments reporting the manufacture of automobiles, and 20 establishments "with about one-fourth of the total value of products for the whole industry."

Cutlery and tools.—Connecticut ranks second in this industry in the United States. The value of the products for this industry was \$10,716,918.

Hats and fur felt industry.—Connecticut was second in importance in this industry, with 21.7 per cent of the total value of products for the United States.

Clocks.—Connecticut ranked first in clocks and watches in the value of products. Nine of the sixteen industries in the State were engaged primarily in the manufacture of clocks. This branch of the industry in Connecticut dates back as far as early in 1800, and much of its early development took place in that State, where it has been largely centralized.

The foundry and machine shops gave employment to 37,736 persons, or more than twice as many as any other single industry of the State. The average number of wage earners in the leading cities and towns were as follows:

Bridgeport	25,775
New Haven	23,547
Waterbury	20,170
Hartford	14,627
New Britain	13,513
Meriden	7,845
Danbury	4,810
Torrington	4,488
Norwich	4,470
Ansonia	4,127
Stamford	3,984
Naugatuck	3,464
Willimantic	3,020
Middletown	2,434
New London	2,225

Bridgeport.—This city was the foremost city in the State in manufactures, with 47.1 per cent in value of products and 37.2 per cent in average number of wage earners. Compared with other manufacturing cities of the country, Bridgeport ranked thirty-third in the value of products for 1910. The foundries and machine shops of this city turned out products valued at \$9,752,000, or 14.9 per cent of the corresponding total for the State. The corset industry was also considered of importance, with an output valued at \$6,899,000, or 53.8 per cent of the total value for the industry of the State.

New Haven.—This city was the second city of the State as measured by the value of products, with 28.8 per cent in value of products and 9.8 per cent in average number of wage earners.

Waterbury.—The third manufacturing city of the State, showed an increase of 55.6 per cent in value of products and 30.9 per cent in number of wage earners compared with that of 1904. The industries of this city are centralized in a single one—that of brass and bronze manufacturing. In 1910 the reported products amounted to \$31,462,000, or 62.5 per cent of the total for the city. In 1910, 21 per cent of the value of all the brass and bronze products manufactured in the United States was reported from Waterbury. Over two-fifths of the total value of clocks and watches manufactured in the United States was reported from Waterbury. Other industries of importance were the manufactures of foundry and machine-shop products, gas, electric fixtures and lamps, needles, pins, hooks and eyes, and buttons.

Hartford.—The fourth manufacturing city of the State has showed an increase of 56.6 per cent in the value of products and 30.4 per cent in the number of wage earners compared with 1904. These gains were largely due to the increase in the manufacture of automobiles, foundry and machine-shop products, rubber goods, typewriter and typewriter supplies. The major portion of the value of the output for the State of dentists' materials, nails and spikes not made in steel works or rolling mills, feather belting, and machine screws was reported from this city.

Norwich shows the greatest gain in the value of products from 1904 to 1910 with 55.9 per cent, and New Britain the greatest in the number of wage earners with 34.2 per cent. The manufactures of New Britain are so centralized in the hardware industry that the output of this industry reports 52.9 per cent of the total value of products for the city; 44.2 per cent of the value of cutlery and tools made in the State for 1910 were reported from New Britain.

Norwich.—In this city the textile industries are of the most importance.

Ansonia and Torrington.—The most important industries of these cities are the manufactures of brass and bronze and machine tools.

Meriden.—The silverware and plated-ware industry is the most important in this city. In 1910 this city reported 65.9 per cent of the total value of gas and electric fixtures and lamps and reflectors manufactured in the State.

Naugatuck.—The leading industries are the manufacture of rubber boots, shoes, and rubber goods.

Middletown.—The most important industry is the manufacture of men's furnishings (elastic goods).

Danbury.—Its leading industry is the fur-felt hat manufactures. The output in 1910 was valued at \$7,114,683 and formed 68.6 per cent of the total value reported for this industry in the State.

The manufacture of locks makes the machine-shop and foundry industry the most important in Stamford, and the textile industry predominates in Willimantic and New London.

Industry.	Number of establishments.	Persons employed.
Boots, shoes, cut stock, and findings	10	17,890
Brass and bronze products	80	1,133
Buttons	20	6,195
Clocks	16	14,887
Cotton, small wares	52	8,094
Cutlery and tools	82	1,817
Dyeing and finishing textiles	10	9,205
Firearms and ammunition	10	42,101
Foundries and machine shops	403	6,500
Hats, fur-felt	94	3,525
Hosiery and knit goods	21	2,469
Musical instruments, pianos and organs, and materials	17	2,825
Needles, pins, hooks and eyes	8	1,920
Paper and wood pulp	51	9,355
Silk and silk goods	47	1,861
Tobacco	265	5,500
Typewriters	8	

The typewriter industry of Connecticut is a very large one. The Underwood factory at Hartford, Conn., is one of the largest factories of its kind in the world and employs about 3,500 mechanics. The Royal Typewriter factory, of Hartford, is the second largest factory of its kind in the State, employing in the neighborhood of 1,000 mechanics. Besides these two factories there are four other typewriter manufacturing establishments in Connecticut, as follows: The Williams Typewriter Co., of Derby; the Yost Typewriter Co., of Bridgeport; the Blickensderfer Typewriter Co., of Stamford; and the Noiseless Typewriter Co., of Middletown.

FACTORIES IN CONNECTICUT, BY COUNTIES, WHICH WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED TARIFF BILL. NEW HAVEN COUNTY.

There are 240 factories, 80 of which are located in the city of New Haven; 64 in Waterbury, which produces the largest amount of brass, clocks, and novelties of any city in the United States. It is a city of 80,000 inhabitants.

The city of Meriden has 33 manufacturing concerns. Ansonia and Derby have 22. The following towns and cities in New Haven County contain certain important manufacturing establishments: Wallingford, Seymour, Naugatuck, Branford, Beacon Falls, Centerville, Mount Carmel, West Cheshire, Milford, and Clinton.

New Haven's population is 133,000, Meriden's population is 32,000, Ansonia's population is 15,000, and Derby's population is 9,000.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY.

There are 220 factories, 81 of which are in Bridgeport; Danbury, which is the center of the hat industry of the United States, and has a population of 23,500, has 57 factories engaged in this industry, together with the adjoining town of Bethel, with a population of 4,000 and 18 more factories.

There are 18 more factories in the hat industry in Norwalk and South Norwalk, and these two towns have a population of about 16,000, making a total of 93 factories in these four towns engaged in the hat industry.

Other towns which contain manufacturing interests are Stamford, Shelton, Fairfield, Brookfield, New Canaan, and Mianus.

HARTFORD COUNTY.

There are 208 factories in Hartford County, 79 of which are located in Hartford, the population of which is 99,000.

Bristol and Forestville, with a population of 23,000, have 20 factories.

New Britain, with a population of 44,000, has 22 factories.

Windsor Locks, with a population of 4,000, has 10 factories.

Plainville, with a population of 3,000, has 12 factories.

Southington and Plantsville, with a population of 6,500, have 9 factories.

Manchester, which is the center of the silk industry of the State, has a population of 14,000.

Other towns which will be affected are Glastonbury, Unionville, Thompsonville, Suffield, Avon, and Simsbury.

NEW LONDON COUNTY.

There are 72 factories in New London County.

Norwich, with a population of 20,000, has 22 factories.

This county has 50 factories engaged in the manufacture of cotton, woolen goods, and textiles. There are also 10 factories in this county engaged in the manufacture of paper and paper board. A great many guns and firearms of various descriptions are also manufactured in the town of Norwich. Other towns that will be affected are New London, Stonington, Taftville, Uncasville, Voluntown, Montville, Jewett City, Baltic, Mystic, and Oakdale.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY.

There are 56 factories in Middlesex County.

Middletown, with a population of 20,000, has 18 factories.

Deep River and Ivorytown, with a population of about 5,000, are the center of the ivory industry of the United States. Ivory tusks have always been on the free list and are free in every other country on the globe. This bill proposes to put a duty of 20 per cent upon ivory tusks. Other towns which will be affected by the bill are Chester, East Hampton, Higganum, Moodus, Centerbrook, Portland, and Rockfall.

WINDHAM COUNTY.

There are 52 factories in Windham County.

Willimantic, town of Windham, with a population of 13,000, has 12 factories.

Putnam, with a population of 7,000, has 14 factories.

Forty-two factories in this county are engaged in the manufacture of cotton and woolen goods and textiles. Other towns which will be affected are Danielson, Central Village, Dayville, Moosup, Plainfield, Wauregan, Sterling, Ballouville, Packer.

LITCHFIELD COUNTY.

There are 46 factories in Litchfield County.

Winsted, with a population of 9,000, has 9 factories.

Torrington, with a population of 17,000, has 7 factories.

Thomaston, with a population of 4,000, and Terryville, with a population of 5,000, have 5 factories. Other towns which will be affected are Hotchkissville, Lakeville, and Northfield, which towns are engaged in the manufacture of cutlery.

Oakville, with a population of 4,000, has factories which produce pins of all kinds and employ about 1,500 hands.

New Hartford has the largest brush factory in the State.

Bantam and New Milford are two other towns which will be affected by the bill.

TOLLAND COUNTY.

There are 43 factories in Tolland County, 35 of which are engaged in the manufacture of woollens, cotton, and textiles.

Rockville, with a population of 9,000, has 10 factories engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods and textiles and is the largest manufacturing town of woolen goods of any city in the State.

Stafford, with a population of 6,000, has 12 factories.

Other towns which will be affected are Somerville, Eagleville, Andover, Mansfield Center, Coventry, Talcottville, and Willington.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, this Chamber seems to have within its walls a number of prophets of evil, croaking evangels of disaster. The atmosphere we breathe has become impregnated with the malodor, so to speak, of direful prophecy. It seems as if our friends on the other side, or many of them at least, are hungering for a panic. They are doing everything in their power to create distrust.

I wonder if they really want industrial depression; if they really desire that there should be a halt in the progress and prosperity of the country. It is hard to believe, and yet that is the impression being created here and elsewhere. Every Senator on that side who rises to speak has a blue tale of woe to tell, made up for the most part of doleful prophecies of certain disasters to come. I submit, Mr. President, that is not the spirit or the tone of that true Americanism that should find expression in the American Senate. I say this because it seems that there can be but one great underlying purpose behind this continuing story of evil prophecy, and that is to create distrust, artificially, and to bring about a state of industrial depression that may redound to the advantage of the Republican Party, on the theory that if something bad should happen the Democratic Party must answer for it and that the Republican Party would be benefited in some corresponding degree. All we hear now are tales of woe.

Mr. WARREN. Does not the Senator believe there could be some tales of woe told in consequence of what has already happened in certain markets in regard to certain commodities by reason of the threatened tariff bill? In my opinion the prophecies made, if made, have been very moderate, and opportunities

have been passed over which, if complaint had been sought for the purpose of complaint, would only require that the truth be known as to what has already happened to many of these industries and is happening every day because of the threatened tariff bill to show that adversity is already upon us as to certain products.

Mr. STONE. That is the very kind of thing Senators are saying here every day, iterating and reiterating it, for absorption by the country.

Mr. WARREN. No; they are not being stated here. There are commodities that have not yet even been spoken of here on the Senate floor as to their market values that have greatly depreciated, and are on the market to-day at radically lower prices than heretofore, and the Senator must know it. I can give the Senator a very considerable list if he wishes it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that scarcely touches the merits of the question. It is possible that some articles can be named the market price of which is lower now than months before, while it is equally true that numerous other articles can be named where the market price is higher now than ever. There are constant fluctuations in the prices of production in almost every line. I do not want to start any hornet's nest, Mr. President, here to-day, and prolong this discussion and waste time; but I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, who is waiting to interrupt me.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not disturb the Senator if it is not entirely agreeable.

Mr. STONE. Oh, it is not disagreeable, except that I do not want to waste too much valuable time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall occupy very little time, as is my custom. I will ask the Senator if he really believes that those of us who honestly entertain the opinion that the passage of this bill will greatly disturb business, and possibly work irreparable injury to the manufacturing business of the country, ought to refrain from stating our views? I will ask the Senator, further, how he interprets the fact that the General Electric Co., which has always borrowed money heretofore at 4 per cent, had to pay 6½ per cent for an issue of one-year securities which it recently put on the market? Does it not indicate that there is already disturbance, and are we not justified in feeling that very likely there will be further disturbance?

Mr. STONE. Oh, there may be some disturbance here and there, traceable to one cause or another. That may happen, and does here and all over the world from time to time. Mr. President, if I were disposed to go far enough at this time to express my real convictions about some things that are going on in this country now—and I may have occasion to be more specific later on—I might say that the first fluttering of any industrial disturbance so far is the result of a deliberate purpose, if not a deliberate conspiracy, on the part of certain men representing important interests in this country to create a disturbance.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator surely does not believe, which has been heretofore asserted without authority, that the men who are carrying on the great industrial enterprises of this country want to create trouble for themselves?

Mr. STONE. For the present I pass that. I am now talking about Republican Senators who day after day are sending out to the country, through the Associated Press and otherwise, warnings and prophecies that we are on a downward toboggan slide to the "demnition bow wows"; that a storm is coming, and that wise men had better run to their cyclone cellars, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. What does the Senator think of the pronouncements that are going out from the White House and from the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. STONE. I think they are very timely.

Mr. GALLINGER. Timely? I think they are very untimely.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I think they are timely. They are timely, for they are intended to advise the country and to discount and thwart the purpose—apparently the deliberate purpose—of men both in and out of Congress to create a feeling in the public mind of unrest with the expectation of some resultant industrial disturbance.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, a question of order. The Senator has stated, in effect, that Members upon this side of the Chamber are sending out reports for the purpose of creating disaster. The Senator having made that charge as to Members on this side, he should specify the Senators who have so done.

Mr. STONE. It would be altogether—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is a very serious charge, and only in line with utterances from other sources seeking to discount the effects of this bill; for instance, by the President of

the United States, who, as is reported, proposes to hang as high as Haman anybody who disagrees with his tariff program. It is, I think, also a proposition that comes from the Secretary of Commerce to investigate and put out of business any manufacturer who does not agree with him, and it is now seriously contended by the Senator from Missouri that if evil results follow the passage of this bill it will be because of the speeches of those opposed to the bill—rather a curious conclusion. Now, I ask what Senator on this side has sent out reports threatening disaster upon this Nation?

Mr. STONE. I have scarcely heard a speech made on the other side since this debate began that did not send forth these doleful messages.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator to name the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I think probably the Senator himself is guilty.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. This Senator has not made a speech.

Mr. STONE. Then the Senator is not guilty in that form; whether he is guilty of this offense in some other form I do not know. But every Senator who has spoken on that side has in some way assured the country that ruin was coming by leaps and bounds. And, Mr. President, I believe it to be true that it is a part of the fixed program of the Republican side of this Chamber to create a widespread impression and a fear throughout the country of coming disaster, with the hope of precipitating industrial and commercial conditions that will redound to their party and political advantage. But, all the same, they will not succeed in accomplishing their purpose, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. I will yield.

Mr. KENYON. I only want to say, Mr. President, as the Senator from Missouri is charging this side en masse with such a purpose, I speak for myself and say that I have not hesitated, wherever an opportunity has been presented, to express the belief that the passage of this bill would not induce any panic or any industrial trouble; and in my State I have watched the sentiment pretty closely, and the farmers and the business men do not share in any such opinion. I trust the Senator will not impute it to everyone on this side.

Mr. STONE. I was not thinking of the Senator when I made the remarks to which he objects. I hardly had the Senator from Iowa, who has just spoken, and other Senators of his type and breadth of thought in my mind. I think that he and they proceed along a different and a higher line, both of thought and conduct, in the discharge of their senatorial duties.

Mr. President, I heard this morning the speech made here by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], full, as the speeches of his colleagues have been, of a blue tale of woe. It so happens that this very morning also I saw a statement as to the commercial and industrial conditions in the country from a report of R. G. Dun & Co., which I propose now to read to the Senate by way of contrast to the typical Republican speech of the Senator from Connecticut. R. G. Dun & Co. is one of the great mercantile credit concerns of the United States. They have their agents in every neighborhood of the United States, who see with their own eyes what the crop prospects are, what the mines are doing, what manufacturers of different kinds are doing, what the merchants are doing, what the bankers are doing, and what business men generally are doing. They furnish reports to their employers, and out of these the central office, after careful analysis and consideration, prepare reports about all kinds of business and for the use of business men everywhere, giving the credit standing of individuals, and giving expression as to the general industrial and economic and commercial conditions of the country, and these are relied upon in great measure by business men throughout the country. Business men pay for the right and privilege of using the reports of this great concern.

Let me read what R. G. Dun said yesterday, and I will put that against what the Senator from Connecticut has said this morning:

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I simply desire to say, if it be true that the business and industrial interests of the country are guided by the business of R. G. Dun & Co., who are very industrious and usually accurate, any expression on the part of an individual Senator here would not be likely to create a panic.

Mr. STONE. I do not think expressions here will create a panic, no matter what the purpose of these expressions may be. I do not think we are going to have any panic, Mr. President; I know we are not. But at the same time I beg to say, with as little offense as possible, that if anything would foment a panic

it would be just such a course as that being pursued by the majority of the minority on the other side.

Now, let me read this, clipped this morning from the New York American. It says:

Fall business is opening with every indication of a sustained boom. Merchants who hesitated placing extensive orders because of pending tariff legislation have been forced to make heavy purchases because of unexpected demands. The impetus foreshadows great and prosperous activity.

The settlement of the tariff controversy is looked forward to expectantly by business men. They are prepared to make new investments and embark on large enterprises the moment Congress acts, no matter whether it changes the tariff or not.

Many large merchants who a month ago complained of slack trade now report their shelves are almost empty.

The people are anxious to have tariff legislation ended. The business men of the country want it disposed of and out of the way at the earliest possible moment, so that they may settle down to something definite and have an end to uncertainty. But Republican Senators insist on holding it up. Yesterday we were threatened that it might be held up, and this by more than one Senator—held up even until the snow flies—unless Senators on this side will agree not to take up other legislation, especially currency legislation.

But I will continue reading:

The tone of general optimism pervading business circles was expressed by R. G. Dun & Co., mercantile agency, in the following statement to the New York American:

What I have read so far is an introductory preface by the American to the Dun statement. Now comes what the R. G. Dun Mercantile Agency itself said:

Prospects for fall business are satisfactory. Agricultural conditions which underlie the entire business fabric, have seldom been better at this time of the year than they are, and the large crops in practically every section of the country, which will be sold at remunerative prices, insure an active demand through the fall for all kinds of merchandise.

Labor generally is well employed and at remunerative wages. In many of the important manufacturing centers there is some complaint regarding the scarcity of labor, and as numerous advances in wages have been made it is reasonable to suppose there will be a continued good demand for the majority of the commodities which enter into general consumption.

That the people are well provided with funds and will purchase freely is indicated by the liberal orders placed by merchants for fall requirements, some wholesale dry-goods factors reporting they could dispose of more goods were they readily available, while in many instances the volume of business booked measures up very favorably with that of former years.

FOOTWEAR ORDERS.

In footwear, fall orders are being placed in normal volume, notwithstanding high prices, and some manufacturers, especially in the West, say their sales exceed those of any previous corresponding period.

The important iron and steel industry, after a short period of somewhat quieter conditions, appears to be improving and reports are remarkably uniform that prospects are decidedly encouraging.

The uncertainty regarding tariff revision has naturally had a restricting effect in some directions, but it has been more in the nature of curtailing production to current needs than of reducing consumption, and one of the most favorable features of the situation is the fact stocks in those lines which will be most affected are barely sufficient to meet the current actual demand.

Any effect tariff change may have on the future has, therefore, been very largely discounted. When the question is finally settled, there will undoubtedly be a marked revival in the demand for all classes of merchandise, which will tax the resources of the country to fill.

CURRENCY QUESTION.

Little attention is apparently being given in mercantile circles to the question of currency alterations, the general belief being whatever change may be made will be for the better. Reports from numerous leading centers state collections are reasonably prompt for this season, and merchants in the country districts expect easier monetary conditions with the movement of the crops.

Current statistics endorse reports of active business, railroad gross earnings being larger than ever before at this period, reflecting an enormous movement of freight, while bank clearings for the latest week made a favorable comparison with a year ago. Foreign trade is also very heavy.

Mercantile failures for the first half of the year showed a decrease in the number, so the strain during a trying period was not so severe, although, owing to an unusual number of large defaults, the amount of liabilities show some increase.

Mr. President, there is a note of optimism, based upon facts gathered by the most careful and widespread examination into the true conditions existing in practically every neighborhood in the United States. How it shines by contrast with this daily croaking here! I, for one, am growing weary almost unto death with this endless pessimistic chatter, and still more with threats that this chatter is to go on, and that the passage of this bill is to be delayed, although the business interests of the country need to have it settled at the earliest possible date, and although the business interests of this country are demanding that the chatter shall end and the legislation be completed without delay. It is time for the country to understand just what the trouble is.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not wonder that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], in view of the discussion that has been had and that will be had on this bill, showing

its imperfections and its atrocities, is growing weary. It is natural that the Senator should grow weary. Considering the time that our Democratic friends took to consider this bill in committee and in a Democratic caucus covering a period of nearly three months, it is rather remarkable that the Senator from Missouri should find fault that we have kept it under discussion for two weeks in the Senate; but it does not appeal to me.

The Senator, Mr. President, is too excited this morning. I think the Senator came very near to violating a rule of the Senate this morning, which I will read—paragraph 2 of Rule XIX:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator has made very serious charges against Senators on this side of the Chamber. I think he has imputed to them unworthy motives, in violation of that rule, which ought always to be observed in debate.

I do not see nor can I feel that anything has been said or done that needs to excite the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator on that side of the Chamber. We are proceeding in a very orderly way in debating this bill. Yesterday the Democratic side of the Chamber took quite as much time as the Republican side in the debate, and I was very glad to see them do that, because their silence heretofore has been a little oppressive to some of us. We will continue to debate this bill item by item and schedule by schedule until it is completed, and some of us will continue to do it in our own way. I speak for no one but myself. I regretted yesterday that the suggestion was made in debate that somebody was speaking for this side of the Chamber. It certainly was not me. I speak for myself only now and at every other time.

I hope that the suggestions and predictions of the house of R. G. Dun & Co. are based upon substantial foundations, but the Senator from Missouri suggested, before reading the article, that the shelves of our merchants were practically empty, so far as goods are concerned. That is natural. With three or four hundred million dollars' worth of foreign goods in bond to-day in the United States that are to be dumped upon the American market without the payment of duty if this bill passes in its present form, why should any merchant purchase goods and stock his shelves? I have talked with merchants on that point in my own State and elsewhere and they tell me they are not going to do it; that they are going to wait until they get cheaper goods. Why should any man buy wool to-day and pay the duty on it if he is to have free wool? Why should a merchant stock up with sugar and pay a duty on it if he is to have free sugar? And so on through the list.

I say to the Senator that I frankly join with him in the hope that we may not have any industrial disaster, but educated in the school that I have been educated in, believing as I do in the policy of protection, which I do not find in this bill, I can not free my mind from the conviction, which I shall express at all proper times, that the passage of this law will bring industrial disturbance and, I fear, industrial disaster to the people of the United States. That feeling is shared by the people whom I so inadequately represent. I would be very glad to disabuse their minds of that feeling if I could, but I share with them in that feeling, and I deplore the possibility of this bill ever becoming a law. That it will become a law I presume is to be expected, and when it becomes a law it will then be tested by the American people. If it works out as well as the Senator from Missouri thinks it will, the Democratic Party will have justified itself before the people of the United States. The Democratic Party will have proved that the Republican Party all through its history has been wrong, so far as its contentions on tariff matters are concerned; but if, on the other hand, it proves not to work well, if it proves a detriment to the people of the United States, if it brings industrial disturbance and commercial disaster to our people, then the Democratic Party will have failed in its contention and the country will return, as I believe it will return, to the policies and doctrines of the great Republican Party.

Now, Mr. President, let us keep good-natured about this matter. Let us go along with the consideration of this bill as best we can. Let us cross swords with our Democratic friends when we think they are wrong, and let them at such length as they choose try to convert us to the unsound views that they hold regarding this proposed legislation.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, not relating at all to anything which has been said by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]; but the privilege I claim is that of gladly admitting my acquaintance with a gentleman in South Dakota, any knowledge of whom it would appear that I denied yesterday in my remarks on the tariff bill in a colloquy with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. On

page 2844 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the colloquy occurs, and it appears I was asked if I knew Mr. A. E. Chamberlain, formerly of the agricultural department of the State. Later I was asked in regard to knowing him as connected with the agricultural college at Brookings. At the time of the inquiry—

Mr. JAMES. I should merely like to suggest to the Senator from South Dakota, if he is addressing himself to a question of privilege which relates to a colloquy had with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], that the Senator from Montana is not in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. STERLING. It does not involve the Senator from Montana at all, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. I beg the Senator's pardon. I could not hear his suggestion, and I merely wished to suggest the absence of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. STERLING. There is no dispute between the Senator from Montana and myself as to what occurred; but at the time of the inquiry I did not catch the initials of the gentleman's name as given by the Senator from Montana, and I did not know of his connection with the agricultural department of the State, save that I had, of course, known that Mr. A. E. Chamberlain had been engaged in conducting farmers' institutes in the State. I did not know that he had had any connection whatever with the agricultural college at Brookings, nor, as the Senator stated, that my friend, A. E. Chamberlain, headed the delegation that came to Washington in connection with the reciprocity measure. Hence I said, in response to the questions of the Senator from Montana, that I did not know the gentleman. I am happy to say that I do know him, and he is a very estimable gentleman. I recognize him since I have learned his initials and ascertained that he is the gentleman to whom the Senator from Montana referred at the time.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has read an optimistic statement from the R. G. Dun Mercantile Agency, and I have myself noticed that the Dun reports have been remarkably optimistic during the tariff debate. It does not seem to me, however, that the statements are borne out by the facts.

Before briefly calling the attention of the Senate to several specific instances of failure, the closing of mills, and the general curtailment of business in Pennsylvania, occurring very recently, I should like to remind the majority of this body of the circumstances under which this legislation is now pending. It was held for nearly a month in secret conference. The minority have had little or no opportunity to learn why changes were made in the bill or what changes were made. The country expects of the minority to debate to a reasonable extent and to expose, from the point of view of the Republican protectionists, the objections to the pending measure. There is not the slightest desire on the part of anyone on this side of the Chamber to delay this bill one day. Three-quarters of the time consumed up to the present in the discussion of this measure has been occupied by the majority in control of this legislation. I have not seen the situation stated more concisely than in the clipping from the Washington Herald, which I shall now send to the desk and ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows from the Washington Herald of May 20, 1913:

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS.

In a recent issue of a monthly magazine President Wilson expressed some interesting ideas regarding the preparation of tariff and currency laws. His main contention was that "the people" were not heard. He objected to the fact that big manufacturers, bankers, and heads of railroad corporations were chiefly consulted when important legislation was to be enacted. But, most of all, he condemned the practice of considering these matters in secret under conditions which gave the people no opportunity to know how and why the legislators arrived at their course of action.

"I do not want," to quote President Wilson's own words, "a smug lot of experts to sit down behind closed doors in Washington and play Providence to me."

The administration of President Wilson, marked thus far by honesty and sincerity of purpose, can not afford to suffer the taint of secret manipulation. If the tariff bill which passed the House is to be changed in the Senate, the country has a right to know why the amendments have been made. The record should be public. The reason for changes must not only be apparent, but convincing, and it can not be either if the veil of secrecy envelops senatorial action.

Not only the Democratic administration but the Senate is on trial. Neither can hope to retain popular favor if tariff legislation is to be effected behind closed doors. It may be that Democratic Senators do not want to hear the warnings which would be uttered nor listen to statements which would make good campaign material for the opposition. We can not believe that fear inspires their line of conduct. This being the case, and it being equally certain that no Senator has any desire to do in secret that which he would not do in the open, there seems to be no ground whatever for the program of secrecy which has been entered upon.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the charge was frequently made when the Payne-Aldrich bill was being framed that the then majority in this Chamber surrendered their judgment to the chairman of the Finance Committee. It is evident that the method has only been slightly altered, if the truth of the charge made is to be admitted, which I do not admit.

There is, however, no question of the fact that the majority Senators in this body have absolutely surrendered not only their own judgment but the interests of their constituents to a Democratic caucus; and the only reply that has heretofore been made was the reply made yesterday by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that they were no worse than the Republicans had been four years ago.

As to these rosy views of Dun, I hold in my hand the statement of a failure, a complete closing of one of the largest textile concerns in southeastern Pennsylvania, occurring two or three days ago. I will ask the Secretary to read the short notice of it which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Public Ledger of July 29, 1913.]

CHESTER PLANT IDLE—HETZEL TEXTILE MILLS CLOSED, OWING TO TARIFF UNCERTAINTY. CHESTER, PA., July 28.

George C. Hetzel, president of Hetzel & Co., owners of a large textile plant in this city, in explaining the cause for closing down for an indefinite period, declares that owing to the present tariff bill the wholesale clothiers who buy from them will not give orders for new goods.

Mr. Hetzel further said: "For the present we will run only the finishing and dyehouse. In former years we were always successful in having on hand sufficient orders to keep the plant running in between the seasons until the next season's orders began to come in. This year such has not been the case, owing to the present tariff uncertainty."

About 300 persons are affected as a result of the weaving department being closed. When the few orders on hand are finished the finishing department and dyehouse will be shut down.

Mr. PENROSE. In other words, Mr. President, 300 persons have already been thrown out of employment and several hundred more will be thrown out of employment in a short time.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the reports of Dun & Co. and Bradstreet & Co. show that the failures this year, week by week, have been fewer than during the last year?

Mr. PENROSE. I have already admitted that a strange optimism prevails in the reports of these two mercantile agencies, but they are not borne out by the facts.

Mr. JAMES. Of course, mercantile agencies are not political organizations trying to further the interests of political parties. We should not infer, I hope, from the Senator's statement that he wants to have the country believe that Dun & Co. and Bradstreet & Co. are making false reports of the business conditions of the country.

Mr. PENROSE. Not intentionally; but I think their sources of information must be extremely poor.

Mr. JAMES. Does the Senator think, sitting in the Chamber here as a Senator from Pennsylvania, and, of course, very intensely in favor of protection, that he is a better judge of the business conditions of the country than these great business organizations?

Mr. PENROSE. I do, so far as Pennsylvania is concerned.

Mr. JAMES. These organizations ramify every part of the Nation and get daily and weekly reports of the condition of the business of the country.

Mr. PENROSE. I am only speaking for eastern Pennsylvania, and I think that I know a great deal more than does any mercantile agency about conditions there.

I will go further and state, for the information of the Senator, that in addition to the complete shutdown of this very well-known, long-established, and thoroughly solvent concern there is not a textile industry east of the Susquehanna River in the State of Pennsylvania that is working more than three days a week at the present time.

I took occasion to select a small county, the county of Lebanon, in eastern Pennsylvania, with a number of small, diversified industries, and I had a person go up there and find out just what was going on. I have a report, received in the last few days, which I should like the Secretary to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Colebrook furnaces, two in number, owned by the Lackawanna Iron & Steel Co., managed by Lloyd Wolfe, a Democrat, one shut down.

Mr. Wolfe informed me that no men were laid off, as they were given work cleaning up and repairing, but in a week or so they would be compelled to proportion the work and have half the force work one week and alternate.

Mr. Wolfe reluctantly admitted that the shutdown was caused by the poor condition of the iron market; also that they were making iron at a loss and storing most of it waiting for better prices.

If matters do not change I am willing to say that several hundred men will be out of employment at this plant.

They are operating three other furnaces here, and there are rumors on the streets that they will close down also. Most of this information was given me by Wolfe confidentially.

Lebanon Blast Furnace Co., owned by the Melly estate (old-fashioned furnace), shut down tight; 100 men out of work. George Melly, one of the owners, very bitterly condemns and blames the Democratic tariff makers for the trouble.

Sheridan furnace, one, owned by the Berkshire Iron Co., located at Sheridan, Pa., this county, shut down tight; 200 men out of work. I could not learn from the manager the cause, for the reason that he was also dropped and, I understand, has left these parts.

The facts as stated are pretty reliable. I spoke with each one of the managers, except in the case of the one connected with the Sheridan furnace, and that information I got over the telephone from one of the leading business men in that section, so you can rely upon its being correct.

Mr. PENROSE. As I have said, Mr. President, Lebanon County is one of the smaller counties of the State. The 1,000 persons at present out of employment in that county can not find the wherewithal for their daily sustenance out of the rosy reports of the Dun Mercantile Agency.

I will ask the Secretary to read further an extract from the Lebanon Daily Times. I have purposely selected this small rural section, which the traveler on a train passing through would not suppose had an industry in it, to illustrate what must be going on all over the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is a seething mass of industrial establishments. I desire to state here that Mr. Coleman, who makes the comment, is one of the largest manufacturers in that section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Lebanon Daily Times, May 15, 1913.]

MR. B. DAWSON COLEMAN'S COMMENT ON THE CLOSING OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS—THE DIRECT RESULT OF THE ABANDONMENT OF THE COUNTRY'S POLICY OF PROTECTION TO AMERICAN LABOR.

It may seem like a matter hardly worth noticing in these times of general prosperity, when everybody who wants it has work to do, but, nevertheless, it would be a grave mistake on the part of anyone not to give at least a moment's consideration to the shutting down of the iron plants of this county. Not so long ago there were three more in operation than at the present time, and why is a question well worth asking. On no less an authority than the word of the resident manager of the Pennsylvania Steel Co., Mr. B. Dawson Coleman, the reason given is that it does not pay under present uncertain conditions growing out of the new tariff laws to run such plants at their top speed. To be in business and lose money is a very uncomfortable situation, and add to that the more uncertain future, and we have a situation that is almost unbearable. Like it as we may, it must be a source of satisfaction to men who during the last general election campaign made predictions that are now approaching their fulfillment, and yet at the time they were scoffed at as the statement of demagogues who were seeking to make political capital out of the situation. However much this is to be derided, when the men and the cause they represented are taken into consideration it is not too early for anyone to stand up and attempt to say that the danger flag was not sincerely waved and the situation was as plainly described as common language could make it. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating is an old saying, and now statements then made are being put to the test in a very uncomfortable manner. A decided change in the revenue policy of the country can not be made without the effect of it being felt in every walk of life, even down to the lowest-paid laborer who depends upon his hard-earned daily wage for support. The situation in connection with the closing down of one of the North Lebanon furnaces, owned and run by the Pennsylvania Steel Co., one of the largest and most prosperous in the country, under the management of one of Lebanon's most influential citizens, is cause enough to awaken earnest inquiry, and the answer comes as a thunder clap from a clear sky, leading to an awakening most terrifying. Most people not initiated are not aware that under present conditions pig iron in Lebanon is being made at a loss, pointing to a future so dark and forbidding from an industrial point of view, in the face of what the Democratic policy of the present administration is doing, as to make it almost suicidal for any manufacturer to continue to make or turn out a product in the faint hope of bettering conditions. In order that, from a humanitarian standpoint, labor may continue to find employment, as has often been the case. The situation is such at this time that capital must be conserved to meet unseen contingencies, and as a result the first to suffer most keenly will be labor. Sad as that is to contemplate, the fact remains and can not be gainsaid. This, then, brings up a subject too often slightly alluded to, namely, politics. In the few addresses Mr. Coleman made on the stump, when his interest was aroused to an extraordinary degree by what he saw might be the result and from a kindly consideration for the many men in his employ who were being carried away on the wild tide of progressivism, he then plainly foretold just what is beginning to be realized; and if that does not afford food for reflection, we hardly know what will. It is now a condition, not simply a theory, that confronts us; and sad as it is, it would be infinitely sadder if the occasion were allowed to pass by without some allusion to the cause, and our community, at least, is under a debt of obligation to Mr. Coleman and men like him who stand forth as captains of industry to have them tell the people the straight truth, so that should the occasion again present itself the right kind of an effort can be made by men with their better judgment aroused most keenly in a very drastic manner to correct the evils that now are upon us and threatening to grow with increased crushing power as the wailing, dying cry of murdered American industries rolls over the land.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate by too many instances showing the lack of correct information which seems to exist on the part of Dun's Mercantile Agency; but I should like to have a short account of the closing down of furnace No. 3 in Lebanon read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Lebanon Daily News, Lebanon, Pa., Tuesday, May 13, 1913.]

NO. 3 FURNACE WILL BE IDLE—NORTH LEBANON PLANT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STEEL CO. WILL BE BLOWN OUT—SLUMP IN THE MARKET—RESIDENT MANAGER B. DAWSON COLEMAN GIVES EXPRESSION TO VIEWS.

While Democratic Congressmen at Washington and the Democratic press throughout the country are still preaching the doctrine of prosperity without a protective tariff, and while President Wilson is still threatening anybody who attempts to "start something" in the way of industrial trouble, the tariff tinkering is certainly having its bad effects; and Lebanon to-day feels its first effects in the shape of the stoppage of a furnace.

BLOWN OUT TO-NIGHT.

No. 3 furnace, of the North Lebanon plant of the Pennsylvania Steel Co., will be blown out to-night, and that furnace will be idle for an indefinite period. It remains to be seen whether the other furnace will also be blown out later. That is not in immediate prospect, however, for the Pennsylvania Steel Co. is an unusually large concern, and its manufacturing plants at Steelton and elsewhere may keep the remaining furnace in operation no matter what may happen. Such, at least, is the hope of the local officials.

MIGHT SUSPEND FOR REPAIRS.

Although it was announced some time ago that the Lackawanna Iron & Steel Co.'s Colebrook and Cornwall plants might suspend for repairs at any time, Supt. Wolfe stated this morning that no orders for a suspension had been received up to the present time.

IRON MARKET HIT.

B. Dawson Coleman, resident manager of the Pennsylvania Steel Co., was interviewed this morning on the subject of the proposed shutdown of No. 3 furnace.

"Is the proposed suspension necessary for repairs or is it occasioned by tariff possibilities?" he was asked.

"No. 3 furnace is in excellent shape," replied Mr. Coleman. "I do not want to say that the prospective tariff schedules are directly responsible, for I do not know that for a certainty, but I do know that some influence or other has hit the iron market very hard, for prices have been going down steadily during the past several months. And even at the reduction there is no demand for it. We have been storing some iron lately and we do not think it advisable to continue doing so under the uncertain conditions now prevailing."

"What is your opinion of the present tariff bill as it passed the House last week and as it is now under consideration by the Senate?"

"I have only a general opinion to make in this regard," replied Mr. Coleman, "and that is that I am sincerely afraid that the Democrats are going to make their usual mess of things. They were placed in power not by a majority of the people, but by a combination of circumstances in which the Bull Moose movement played a conspicuous part, and yet the Democratic Representatives at Washington presume to say that the American people want a tariff for revenue only. I do not believe it. I am firmly convinced that the majority of the people do want protection for American industries. And the wisdom of such a course is apparent in the fact that the mere mention of letting down the bars to admit foreign competition on a cheap-labor basis is sufficient to cause a slump in prices and hold up the demand for other products of American mills, as well as of iron."

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, these small industries which have suffered devastation as the result of the mere menace of this bill are in no way connected with any great combination or trust or aggregation of capital or industrial concerns. They are in the hands of small private owners. As I say, it has already affected one of the smaller counties of the State to such an extent that 1,000 men are thrown out of employment.

Going to another part of the country, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Greystone Mills closed completely. Greystone, I believe, is somewhere near Providence, R. I. It was stated by the firm of Messrs. Joseph Benn & Sons that the provisions of the new tariff bill made it absolutely impossible for the firm to compete successfully with imported goods and that a stoppage of machinery would take place immediately.

At Greystone, Messrs. Benn & Sons are spinners and manufacturers of mohair and alpaca, and employed about 1,500 work people, who are now absolutely out of employment, and are supposed to receive consolation from the rosy reports of Dun's Mercantile Agency. The business has been built up under the shelter of protective duties until it has now reached a high state of prosperity. The Greystone mills were opened in February, 1905. Mr. Harrison Benn, in an interview, says:

There is nothing strange in it, nor is there anything that a person can not understand. Our business here is different from that of other manufacturers in this country in that we have two plants, one here in Greystone and the other in Bradford, England.

This is not the only instance, Mr. President, of two plants, one in this country and one abroad.

We make the same kind of goods in each mill from the same kind of stock, and for that reason, when we find that we can manufacture a style cheaper in one mill than we can in the other we transfer the order to that mill. In the present case I have asked the Congressmen from this State to try and have an adequate protective duty placed upon mohair and alpaca goods that we may be able to operate both of our plants.

This seems to be something that they either can not or will not do, and for that reason I find that under the proposed Underwood Tariff Act I can make goods in Bradford and land them in New York at about 4 cents a yard cheaper than I can make them in Greystone and ship them to New York.

One final case, and I am done—that of the Sharpless cream separator concern, located about 30 miles from Philadelphia, in the city of West Chester. The Sharpless cream separator is an invention of Mr. Sharpless, on which he has built up a plant there employing many men and women and children. His goods, the cream separators, are shipped not only all over the United States but all over the world, to China and to the Orient. Within a week that concern has completed the absolute transfer of its plant to Hamburg, and no longer is there a vestige of it left in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to say to my distinguished friend and neighbor just across the Delaware River in Pennsylvania that the closing of mills in Pennsylvania is not a new thing. I have done a good deal of missionary work over in Pennsylvania, and I have found iron mills in Pennsylvania closed for the past 15 years under the reign and régime of the Republican Party and the high protective tariff system.

Mr. PENROSE. I should be glad if the Senator would mention a specific instance. I do not recall a mill that has been closed.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say furnaces, rather than mills. I have found furnaces and I have found mills in Pennsylvania that have been closed; and I have found, and know from my own knowledge, as the Senator does, of most disastrous labor troubles in Pennsylvania that have come about under the régime of the high tariff. I want to say further that, while the distinguished Senator comments adversely upon the reports of Dun's Agency and upon the calamity that has come to steel-mill owners, I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Times of July 30, to-day, which states in large letters:

Steel earnings up to \$41,219,813—Quarter ended shows 15.70 per cent on common stock—Only three quarters so good.

Then it goes on further to state that this is the most remarkable in the history of the company.

Big gain over first period, and, compared with same months last year, increase is \$16,100,000—Far better than expected.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I submit that, really, for the past eight months, but certainly for the past six months, we have been living in an era of tariff reform. It was in the very atmosphere. The world knew it. Everybody knew it. Every manufacturer and every mill owner knew it throughout the length and breadth of our country; so our friends can not raise this calamity howl in the hope of catching votes. Your case, I am sorry to say for you, is past redemption and past hope.

I find that the New York Sun says—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is too bad to interrupt this.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; it is not too bad to interrupt me. I know exactly what the Senator from Pennsylvania will say.

Mr. OLIVER. Then the Senator had better say it, Mr. President. I will yield to him.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know just what he will say. It will be hung all over with crêpe and sadness and sorrow. Everything is going to chaos, to death, and destruction, under your theory. Yet the fact is, as I said before, that in your own State the most calamitous strikes, that brought bloodshed, death, sadness, sorrow, and starvation to scores and scores of mill workers, have come under your régime.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator to name one.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will point to the Homestead strike and the Bethlehem Steel strike under your McKinley law.

Mr. OLIVER. Twenty-one years ago!

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not care whether it is 21 or twice 21 years ago. We tried it out. The public knew it. It made the disturbance and has created the discontent of labor.

I want to say, further, that the New York Sun of to-day—and God knows nobody will claim that that paper is very much on our side of the question—goes on to speak, in its financial article, of "underlying firmness in stocks despite unfavorable influences."

What are the "unfavorable influences"? The "unfavorable influences" are the depression that the great financial interests would endeavor to bring about and the calamity that these two Senators, distinguished and capable though they are, have held up.

The article goes on to say—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me for just a minute.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Proceed; I will yield.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator has alluded to "these two Senators." I desire to call his attention to the fact that if I am one of the two, I have not said anything so far. I have predicted no calamity. While the Senator from New Jersey has very kindly volunteered to anticipate what I was going to say, I regret to say that his anticipation of my remarks is entirely different from the remarks I intended to make.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I stand corrected, then. I should like to hear the Senator now give us a portrayal of glory and hope for the future.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that my colleague alluded to a number of iron plants in the eastern part of Pennsylvania that had shut down. In reply to that the Senator from New Jersey has read a report of the earnings of the United States Steel Corporation.

The United States Steel Corporation does not own a single plant in Pennsylvania east of the Allegheny Mountains. Its entire holdings in that State are in the western part of the State. The United States Steel Corporation does not make one-fourth of the steel that is made in Pennsylvania.

I said a year ago, when a bill similar to this was before the Senate, and I say now, that so far as the steel industry is concerned, the industrial managers who have anything to fear from this proposed legislation are not the men who run the United States Steel Corporation, but the men who have the small plants, many of which are in eastern Pennsylvania, some in the western part of the State, and others scattered over the whole length and breadth of the land. They and the men they employ are the ones that will suffer from this change.

I am not here to predict disaster. I hope it will not come.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not believe it will come.

Mr. OLIVER. But I want to say that if it does come the Democratic Party can not unload the responsibility upon this side of the Chamber, but must shoulder it themselves. The responsibility lies with the majority, and not with the minority, whatever may come.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I beg to say to the Senator that the majority are broad enough and big enough to bear it and shoulder it. We are not going to shirk the responsibility. When the distinguished Senator refers to the fact that the particular interest to which I referred is not located in Pennsylvania, I care not. That is no argument. We are not making a tariff for Pennsylvania, but we are making a tariff for this broad land which shall affect all the industries, whether they be in Pennsylvania or in Oklahoma or in New Jersey. We realize this fact, and the public realize it.

Your system has been tried out to the letter, and we know its results. We know that the public are dissatisfied. We know, further, that the reduction of the tariff will, in reason, tend to decrease the enormous profits that have been made by the steel industry and by a thousand other industries.

But, lo; a new calamity came. And what was it? It took the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to preach that. Why, the cows are going to cease to give milk, and there will be no more cream to separate. It will be all water. Hence the Sharpless Separator Co. in Pennsylvania have gone out of the business and are going to Hamburg.

Mr. President, there will be milk given by the cows, whether on the hillsides of New Jersey or on the hills and in the valleys of Lebanon in Pennsylvania; and cream will rise on the milk, and separators will be used, whether they are made by Sharpless or by anybody else. To my mind the idea is too silly to entertain.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have no doubt that cows will continue to perform their functions, and that milk will be consumed by infants and by mature people; but the cream separator will not be the product of American labor, but it will be the product of German labor, brought over here in German vessels.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not believe that. It took American genius to make a Sharpless separator, and Sharpless separators will be used; or if not Sharpless separators, some other separator will be used. Sharpless never found a market for his separator—many a time have I wielded the crank—simply because it was made in Pennsylvania, or under the protective tariff. It found a market because it was an efficient separator of milk from cream.

But now, something else: The New York Times of yesterday—I do not know how I got so chock full of the New York Times, for I have damned it on some occasions [laughter]—the New

York Times of yesterday tells another tale, a horrible tale. All mankind who are compelled to wear clothes in this great land of ours, of course, will clothe themselves now in sackcloth and ashes and go in sadness and sorrow because of the fact that the Times says:

Prices reduced—

By what? By the American Woolen Co., fattened for years with the iniquity of a tariff that robbed humanity. They are going to reduce the tariff and reduce the cost. This article says that they met in conclave yesterday, and men's wear fabrics—take courage, ye men of Pennsylvania, and laborers in Lebanon—men's wear fabrics for the spring of 1914 are cut from 10 to 12½ per cent. So even though some of the mills in Pennsylvania have closed down and riches have poured in the pockets of the owners, resulting from the toil and sweat of the miners and the workmen in your shops and mills, they, thank God, will get some benefits, some advantages from the Democratic Party in the matter of reduction.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Now, give yourself no uneasiness about the Democratic Party. We are here, we believe, to stay. We are here for four years anyhow, and we believe that we will so brighten the dawn of human life in the struggle for bread that our lease of power will be prolonged for many years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey how he is going to brighten the dawn for the 1,000 people at present out of work in Lebanon County?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We are going to brighten the dawn by giving them a fairer opportunity. It is not so much that which a man earns as that which he is obliged to spend. It matters but little to me if I get a rich stipend in wage if I am obliged for myself and family and little ones who may be around me to spend it all for the satisfaction and aggrandizement of some tariff baron.

Mr. PENROSE. Starvation and opportunity seem to be the motto of the Senator from New Jersey. Now, one more question and I am done, if the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I trust we may both live long and that the Senator may have many chances to propound questions to me.

Mr. PENROSE. The river separates us, and we do not want to quarrel every day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We do not quarrel now.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from New Jersey was indicating that a strike was going on in Philadelphia. I think he must have in mind the trolley strike which occurred there.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I did not say Philadelphia.

Mr. PENROSE. That had nothing to do with the mills.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I did not say Philadelphia.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator what his explanation is of the march of Coxey's army and the strike which compelled President Cleveland to call out the United States Army under a free-trade régime?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say your so-called free-trade régime never originated Coxey's army. Coxey's army was originated from unfortunate conditions that led up to that crisis. The tariff system of so-called protection has been the foundation, I believe, of all the social evils that have permeated our system and cursed our land.

Mr. STONE. I ask that we may proceed with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 20, paragraph 80.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 80, page 20, line 16, after the word "stoneware," to strike out "stoneware and earthenware crucibles," so as to read:

80. Common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware made of natural unwashed and unmixt clay; plain or embossed, common salt-glazed stoneware; all the foregoing, not ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 80, page 20, line 20, after the word "ware," to insert "not herein otherwise provided for," so as to read:

If ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner, and manufactures wholly or in chief value of such ware, not herein otherwise provided for, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the paragraph be passed over with the understanding that I may offer an amendment later.

Mr. THOMAS. The entire paragraph?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; paragraph 80.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator desire to have it passed over without acting on the committee amendments?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to understand the status, Mr. President. It was suggested yesterday, as I remember, by the Chair that it was necessary to submit the request to have a paragraph passed over before the committee amendments were finally all of them passed upon. If I am right about that—

Mr. STONE. If it is passed over I do not quite see how we can act on the committee amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee amendments are to be considered first.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well.

Mr. STONE. Then I ask that a vote may be taken on the pending committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 80, page 20, line 21, after the words "ad valorem," to insert:

Stoneware and earthenware crucibles, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have paragraph 80 passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

81. Earthenware and crockery ware composed of a nonvitrified absorbent body, including white granite and semiporcelain earthenware, and cream-colored ware, and stoneware, including clock cases with or without movements, pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware; if plain white, plain yellow, plain brown, plain red, or plain black, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, ornamented or decorated in any manner, and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem; if painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner, and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to make the same request in respect to this paragraph.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I notice that the amendment proposed by the committee in paragraph 82 has the effect of taking a large quantity of the cheaper kinds of earthenware that were covered by paragraph 81 as the bill came from the House and increasing the rate on them from 35 per cent ad valorem to 55 per cent ad valorem. I should like to know the purpose of the need for that change. I have examined the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee and I fail to find any statement contained in the testimony of manufacturers or importers which justified placing a 55 per cent tariff on the common earthenware which is described in this paragraph as semivitrified or semivitreous. In fact, it is the same earthenware apparently that is described as semiporcelain in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. STONE. Which paragraph is the Senator referring to?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Paragraph 82.

Mr. STONE. We have not reached paragraph 82 yet. Paragraph 81 was just read, and the Senator from Wisconsin asked that it be passed over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The reason why I rose at the time I did was because of the request made by the Senator from Wisconsin to pass over the paragraph, and I desired to have the information at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was the previous paragraph that was passed over; not this one. This paragraph has not been read yet.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But there was a request made that this paragraph be passed over.

Mr. STONE. It was paragraph 81.

Mr. SIMMONS. That paragraph has not been read yet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read paragraph 82.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 82, page 21, line 15, after the word "China," to strike out "and," and after the word "porcelain" to insert "and other"; in line 16, after the word "body," to strike out "having a vitrified or semivitrified," and insert "which when broken shows a vitrified or vitreous, or semivitrified or semivitreous," so as to make the paragraph read:

82. China, porcelain, and other wares composed of a vitrified non-absorbent body which when broken shows a vitrified or vitreous, or semivitrified or semivitreous fracture, and all bisque and parian wares, including clock cases with or without movements, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware, if plain white, or plain brown, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem; if painted, colored, tinted, stained,

enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the matter which I desire to get some information on before a vote is taken on the amendment, if there is any information to be had as to the purpose in increasing the rate fixed by the House, which seems to me to be a pretty high rate—35 per cent ad valorem—to 55 per cent ad valorem upon common earthenware, which is manufactured successfully and cheaply in this country. As I gather from the hearings, there is very little fear of foreign competition, so far as the ware described as semivitreous or semivitrified is concerned.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator the only change the Senate committee made in this paragraph was a change suggested by the examiner at the port of New York, and it was intended simply to aid in the administration of the law. The bill as it came from the House read:

China and porcelain wares composed of a vitrified, nonabsorbent body having a vitrified or semivitrified fracture.

It was pointed out to us that china could not be classified in that way unless it had already a fracture; and in the interest of the administration of the law it was suggested that it be changed so that it would read:

Which when broken shows a vitrified or vitreous or semivitrified or semivitreous fracture.

It has been said in the public prints by certain importers that this language was inserted in the bill in the interest of the manufacturers and that it was in the nature of a joker. If it is a joker, it is one that was put over on us by the porcelain and china examiner in New York. I think the criticism made of the old language is justifiable and that this improves it. I do not think it will have the effect that certain importers claim it will have, of largely increasing the tax on goods that will be imported under the rate.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the criticism I have of this paragraph does not apply to manufacturers but to importers, who state that the language would be so confusing that it would carry those articles which are supposed to bear a 35 per cent duty up to 50 per cent and those which bear a 50 per cent duty to 55 per cent. What I wished to inquire was whether the information which the committee had was sufficiently reliable to warrant making the change in the House provision.

Mr. HUGHES. As I stated to the Senator from Washington, the change was made at the instance of the china examiner at the port of New York. The language in the bill as it came from the House is confusing, because the House language was:

China and porcelain wares composed of a vitrified, nonabsorbent body having a vitrified or semivitrified fracture.

The change in that language is simply in the interest of administration.

Mr. WEEKS. It seems to me it is a pretty technical question, and I do not see how any Senator is going to determine for himself what the effect will be.

Mr. HUGHES. Our information is that this sort of classification can be readily made by the examining officers under the proposed language, but that it could not be made under the old language without breaking a piece of the china or a part of the set. They tell us that there will be no difficulty about making the classification under this language.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator from New Jersey allow me?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. I have not heard what the examiner said in regard to this matter, but I will ask the Senator from New Jersey if it is not a mere possible juggle on words that caused this change? As it read when the bill came from the House, "having a vitrified or semivitrified fracture," might not the point be raised by an importer that the glass must absolutely be broken to come under that ruling, while the language is clarified by showing that when broken it shows a vitrified or vitreous fracture?

Mr. HUGHES. That is the idea I was trying to convey. I thank the Senator. That very point was made, and that is the only reason, so far as I know, why the change was made.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I fully agree with the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]; and the only way to make it plainer than it is here, in my opinion, would be to adopt the wording of the present law. But, of course, if the Senator from New Jersey does not want to do that, then this is better than the language in the bill as it passed the House. There is no question as to the real meaning and intent of the paragraph.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious, I think, to anyone reading these two paragraphs together that the effect of paragraph 82 will be to very largely negative paragraph 81. Paragraph 81 puts semiporcelain at a rate of 35

per cent ad valorem. Paragraph 82, as it was framed by the House, puts porcelain—not semiporcelain, but porcelain described as having a nonabsorbent body and showing a vitrified or vitreous fracture—at a rate of 55 per cent ad valorem. The Senate committee did not change paragraph 81, and left semiporcelain at a rate of 35 per cent; but without changing it it adopts an utterly inconsistent provision, that porcelain having a semivitrified and semivitreous fracture shall bear a rate of 55 per cent. If it has a semivitreous or semivitrified fracture, it is semiporcelain, which, under paragraph 81, will bear a rate of 35 per cent. The effect here is a specific provision, of course, taking precedence over the general provision as to the great quantity of the cheaper kind of porcelain and earthenware. It is not confined to porcelain because after the words "china and porcelain" and before the word "wares" the Senate committee has inserted the words "and other." So it includes all earthenware of a semivitrified and semivitreous fracture and restores the rate of the Payne-Aldrich law upon that cheaper kind of ware.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield in just one second. One objection that is made by some people who are interested in this matter is that so far from having the effect the Senator from New Jersey says of making the law plainer and easier of administration, it would confuse it and make it difficult of interpretation. It is plain to see how that would be the result when you provide that semiporcelain shall have a rate of 35 per cent and that porcelain having a semivitrified fracture shall have a rate of 55 per cent. How is that going to facilitate the administration of the law?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think the Senator's difficulty grows out of some little confusion as to what is embraced in paragraph 81 and in paragraph 82. If the Senator will look at the present law embraced in paragraphs 93 and 94—

Mr. POINDEXTER. There was no classification at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will see that those two paragraphs provided a mixture of china, porcelain and earthenware, and stone and crockery ware. In paragraph 93 the duty imposed on china, porcelain, earthenware, and stoneware, when tinted or painted or enameled, was 60 per cent. It made no difference whether it was chinaware or stoneware; under that paragraph of the old law they were both taxed at 60 per cent if painted or decorated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no classification.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, in paragraph 94 chinaware and porcelain and earthenware and stoneware are put in one paragraph together, and if they are not painted or stained they are taxed at 55 per cent. The Senator will see that those two paragraphs combined the two and made no differentiation whatever between earthenware and chinaware.

Now, what the Senate and the House has attempted to do in paragraphs 81 and 82 is to classify these two wares, which, as everybody knows, are in all their essential qualities and attributes entirely different. The Senator's trouble, I think, arises from the fact that he fails to note that paragraph 81 deals entirely with earthenware and crockery ware.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does it not deal with the same porcelain?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; it does not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. One is of nonvitrified absorbent character; the other is of vitrified nonabsorbent character.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The first part of paragraph 81 is as follows:

Earthenware and crockery ware composed of a nonvitrified absorbent body, including white granite and semiporcelain earthenware.

Paragraph 82 contains the words "and other wares," which includes all those.

Mr. SIMMONS. Paragraph 81 applies to nonvitrified; that is, not of a glassy character and possessing the attributes of absorption.

In the other paragraph we have provided for china and porcelain and other wares composed of vitrified—that is, a glassy nonabsorbent surface—making a clear differentiation between the two upon the one. Earthenware and crockery we have reduced the duty of 55 per cent from the Payne-Aldrich law to 35 per cent and 50 per cent. On the china and porcelain we have reduced the duties from 60 per cent to 40 and 55 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from North Carolina is entirely mistaken in his assumption that I have misunderstood the effect of these paragraphs. I have read them carefully, and the language is so plain that there can not be any two opinions about the fact that paragraph 82 modifies paragraph

81, increasing the duty from 35 per cent to 50 per cent. I was mistaken a moment ago in saying 55 per cent, because that rate of 55 per cent applies only when the ware is decorated; but it increases the rate from 35 per cent to 50 per cent upon the common kinds of porcelain, china, and earthen ware which are in most general use.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about that. Under the present law the kind of ware he is talking about is taxed, as I understand it, at 55 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No. When it is decorated the rate is 55 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; when it is not decorated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is 50 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. When it is not decorated it is taxed under the present law at 55 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am speaking of the bill, not of the present law.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and under the bill—

Mr. HUGHES. The proposed law—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Fifty per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is taxed at 35 and 40 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator undoubtedly places that construction upon the bill, and I hope now that the matter has been pointed out to the committee the committee will consent that this amendment be not adopted, because the effect of it is to put this ware which the Senator says bears a rate of 25 per cent at a rate of 50 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; it is just the reverse.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that where I think he is in error, if he is in error, is in regarding as synonymous the terms "vitrified" or "semivitreous" and "porcelain" and "semiporcelain." I am satisfied, if my information is correct—and I got the information from a gentleman in whom I have the utmost confidence—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator from New Jersey contend that earthenware having a vitrified or vitreous fracture is the same as the earthenware described as having a semivitreous or semivitrified fracture?

Mr. HUGHES. No; what I say—

Mr. POINDEXTER. That difference is the substance of my complaint against this amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator is contending that this language "when broken shows a vitrified or vitreous fracture" carries the articles provided for in paragraph 82 back into paragraph 81.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let me ask the Senator another question. If the Senator is correct as to the purpose of the committee not to modify paragraph 81, why did the committee insert the words "and other" before "wares" and after the word "porcelain"?

Mr. HUGHES. After the word "porcelain" in paragraph 82?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; in line 1, paragraph 82, the words "and other" were inserted before "wares," so as to include all kinds of earthenware as well as porcelain.

Mr. HUGHES. One is an absorbent body and the other a nonabsorbent body. I will say to the Senator this is the same complaint that is made by certain importers with reference to this paragraph. It may be that from the standpoint of the importer the paragraph is unduly high, but the high rate was levied in order that the enormous amount of revenue that is collected from these items should continue to be collected, or as nearly the amount as possible. There is a very important item of revenue involved in the paragraph.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator think that this is a proper object to select for the purpose of collecting revenue?

Mr. HUGHES. Undoubtedly, in my judgment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Common earthenware?

Mr. HUGHES. This is not common earthenware.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; it is.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator is entirely mistaken about that. As I said, the examiner, the man who passes this commodity every day in the appraisers' stores in the port of New York—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it would not make any difference if a thousand appraisers should undertake to say it had that effect, because the language is to the contrary. You have added the words "and other" before "wares." You have modified it by inserting "semi" before the word "vitrified."

Mr. HUGHES. I think the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington just what suggestion he makes or what amendment he offers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am rising to oppose the amendment proposed by the Senate committee. I think that the provision as it came from the House makes sufficiently high the rate of duty.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator then desire to have the entire amendment stricken out?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I desire, at least, to have a vote upon the question whether we shall leave that clause of paragraph 82 as it was before it was amended by the Senate committee.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has asked that this paragraph be passed over.

Mr. HUGHES. Not paragraph 82.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not done so, but I am going to make that request.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to refer to paragraph 81.

Mr. STONE. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin asked that paragraph 81 be passed over, and he also indicated that he would ask that paragraph 82 be passed over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I am going to ask that paragraph 82 be passed over.

Mr. STONE. I understood the Senator to so state, but it had not been read at that time. If it is to be passed over, I suggest that it might not be objectionable to let the amendment remain for further consideration. If there is anything of real merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Washington, the committee will desire to conform its labors to meet the objection. I do not think the objection is well founded at present, but I may be mistaken. Inasmuch as the paragraph is to go over, we shall take up the matter in the committee along with the paragraph itself, if that is satisfactory to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not say it is satisfactory, because I might not be present at the exact time when it is reached; but I accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, and will defer any further remarks on the subject until it is again taken up.

Mr. STONE. Then, let us go on with the bill. Let the paragraph be passed over on the request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and let us take up paragraph 83.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, just a word before the next paragraph is read. I think if the Senator from Washington will carefully examine the two paragraphs, he will find that they are entirely distinct one from the other and refer to different classes of commodities. The first covers all wares that are made of absorbent bodies; the second covers all wares that are made of nonabsorbent bodies. Consequently, the words "and other" were designed as an amendment to include such wares made from "other" nonabsorbent bodies as might not be included in the term "china and porcelain." I think that makes it very distinct.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, apropos of the statement just made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], I would say that I agree with him that there is that distinction between the two paragraphs. I did not claim that paragraph 82 corresponded in every respect with paragraph 81.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator to say that semiporcelain earthenware might be included in the classification of paragraph 82 because of the Senate amendment. I do not see how it is possible, as these wares are composed of nonabsorbent bodies, while semiporcelains are composed of absorbent bodies.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The best information I have is that practically all wares in common use by the ordinary people of the country are nonabsorbent wares and that they would all bear under the Senate amendment a rate of 50 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be. Of course, I am not conversant with the proposition.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 83, page 22, line 15, after the word "carbon," to insert "and manufactures of carbon not specially provided for in this section," so as to make the paragraph read:

83. Earthy or mineral substances wholly or partially manufactured and articles and wares composed wholly or in chief value of earthy or mineral substances, not specially provided for in this section, whether susceptible of decoration or not, if not decorated in any manner, 20 per cent ad valorem; if decorated, 25 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured carbon, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; electrodes for electric furnaces, electrolytic and battery purposes, brushes, plates, and disks, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief

value of carbon, and manufactures of carbon not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will ask to have paragraph 83 passed over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the Senator desires that the paragraph go over without agreeing to the amendment or that the amendment shall be first agreed to?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to oppose any agreement to the amendment being disposed of at this time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph as amended will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 84, page 22, line 23, after the word "feet," to insert "carbons for flaming arc lamps, not specially provided for, and," so as to make the paragraph read:

84. Gas retorts, 10 per cent ad valorem; lava tips for burners, 15 per cent ad valorem; carbons for electric lighting, wholly or partly finished, made entirely from petroleum coke, 15 cents per hundred feet; if composed chiefly of lampblack or retort carbon, 40 cents per hundred feet; carbons for flaming arc lamps, not specially provided for, and filter tubes, 30 per cent ad valorem; porous carbon pots for electric batteries, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have paragraph 84 passed over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the paragraph as amended will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 85, page 23, line 6, after the word "merchandise," to insert "exclusive of those containing quicksilver," so as to make the paragraph read:

85. Plain green or colored, molded or pressed, and flint, lime, or lead glass bottles, vials, jars, and covered and uncovered demijohns, and carboys, any of the foregoing, filled or unfilled, not otherwise specially provided for in this section, and whether their contents be dutiable or free (except such as contain merchandise, exclusive of those containing quicksilver, subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to a rate of duty based in whole or in part upon the value thereof which shall be dutiable at the rate applicable to their contents), 30 per cent ad valorem; *Provided*, That the terms bottles, vials, jars, demijohns, and carboys, as used herein, shall be restricted to such articles when suitable for use as and of the character ordinarily employed as containers for the holding or transportation of merchandise, and not as appliances or implements in chemical or other operations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I take it for granted that the reason those words are proposed to be inserted is that quicksilver in flasks will be taken care of in paragraph 161.

Mr. THOMAS. That is it precisely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read paragraph 86, as follows:

86. Glass bottles, decanters, and all articles of every description composed wholly or in chief value of glass, ornamented or decorated in any manner, or cut, engraved, painted, decorated, ornamented, colored, stained, silvered, gilded, etched, sand blasted, frosted, or printed in any manner, or ground (except such grinding as is necessary for fitting stoppers or for purposes other than ornamentation), and all articles of every description, including bottles and bottle glassware, composed wholly or in chief value of glass blown either in a mold or otherwise; all of the foregoing, not specially provided for in this section, filled or unfilled, and whether their contents be dutiable or free, 45 per cent ad valorem; *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, bottles with cut-glass stoppers shall, with the stoppers, be deemed entireties.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I desire to propose to this paragraph. It applies entirely to the language and not to the rate. I will offer the amendment and ask that the paragraph go over, in order to allow the Senator in charge of the bill and the Committee on Finance to study the matter and see if they can not bring themselves to agree to the terms of the amendment. The object of the amendment is simply to make more certain the intent of the bill. I will ask the Secretary to read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend paragraph 86 as follows:

On page 23, line 25, after the word "glassware," insert "goblets and other glass stem ware"; on page 23, line 25, strike out the words "chief value" and insert in lieu thereof the word "part"; and on page 23, line 25, after the word "blown," insert a comma and the words "cast or pressed."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. OLIVER. If the Senator will allow me, I desire to say a word in explanation of the amendment. I will state that I am not offering an amendment to the rates, not that the

manufacturers of table glassware are satisfied with the rates mentioned, but I do not propose to take up time in offering amendments which I do not believe will meet with the approval of the committee or with a majority of the Senate. The phraseology of this paragraph is, however, faulty. I really think that if the Senator in charge of the bill will allow me to talk to him for a few moments I can convince him to that effect and that he will agree to this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's purpose is to perfect the paragraph?

Mr. OLIVER. It is solely to perfect the paragraph.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think there is a general feeling among glassworkers—certainly among those in Massachusetts—that the reduction which is proposed in this paragraph will bring about a reduction of wages. I am not sufficiently familiar with the matter to demonstrate that fact, but I want to put in the RECORD the opinion of a labor organization, the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, No. 113, of New Bedford, Mass., to the effect that the reduction in the tariff will have a tendency to reduce the wages of glassworkers. They make a protest against the reduction which is contemplated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether he desires to have the document to which he refers printed?

Mr. WEEKS. I offer no amendment, Mr. President. I wanted to get the expression printed; that is all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rose to prefer a request that this paragraph, 86, might be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over. The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 87, page 24, line 7, after the word "Unpolished," to strike out the comma; and in line 8, after the word "glass," to strike out the words "not exceeding 150 square inches, $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 cent per pound; above that, and," so as to make the paragraph read:

87. Unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 384 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; above that, 2 cents per pound: *Provided*, That unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of glass.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think that paragraph ought to be recast, and I am sure, upon a moment's reflection, that it will be apparent to the committee that it ought to be revised. The present classification begins with "crown and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches." This bill, through the amendment which is proposed, extends that classification to take in all such glass, not exceeding 384 square inches, and the duty which is proposed is 1 cent per pound. I can not understand why our Democratic friends propose a duty of 1 cent a pound upon such a classification as this. The Tariff Handbook, before us, furnished for our information, shows that last year the average value of the glass here described, not exceeding 150 square inches, was 1.4 cents per pound. It is provided here that the duty upon that glass shall be 1 cent per pound, or 71 per cent of the foreign value. I see the handbook declares that it is 73.53 per cent. Why in the world do you propose to put a duty of 73.53 per cent upon this small window glass, glass that is a little more than 12 inches each way, the glass which ought to be the cheapest of all the glass in the market? I do not believe that there is any such difference in the cost of production of that kind of glass here and abroad as to warrant a duty of 73 per cent. The highest value of the glass imported under this whole bracket or classification, I believe, is 3.1 cents per pound; and even upon that the duty of 1 cent per pound would be more than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent.

It is manifest that there is no reason for enlarging this bracket and taking in all the glass up to 384 square inches. Even from the standpoint of the protectionist the duty is altogether too high, and from the standpoint of the revenue man it can not be defended at all; and so I must think that it has been an error on the part of the committee.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will not adopt this amendment, but will preserve the classification of the House, which did limit at least the first bracket to glass not exceeding 150 square inches with a duty of seven-eighths of a cent a pound. In my opinion, one-half a cent a pound would be abundant.

I grant you that it is a considerable reduction as compared with the present law; but while there are some duties upon glass in the present law that are not too high, there are many duties, as we demonstrated in the debate of 1909, that are very greatly in excess of the needs of protection.

Now, I should like to know from the Senator from Missouri why he wants to put a duty of 73 per cent on this small glass? If there is any reason, of course I will yield my contest against it at once. I await his reply.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator repeat his question; I did not hear what he said.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri did not hear me, I despair of making him hear me, because I was using a reasonably loud tone of voice. Does the Senator from Missouri refer to any particular part of what I said?

Mr. STONE. I understood the Senator to ask a question. I was engaged here at the moment, and I did not understand what the question was.

Mr. CUMMINS. I asked the Senator from Missouri why he was desirous of imposing a duty of more than 73 per cent upon the small-sized, plain, common window glass?

Mr. STONE. I will say, Mr. President, as to the particular bracket to which the Senator refers and the class of glass to which he refers—

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not hear the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. The class of glass to which the Senator refers is embraced in the tables in brackets 1 and 2. Practically none of that glass used in this country is of domestic production, almost all of it being imported. It is not, in fact, used as a window glass, but—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, of course there is practically none of it imported because the duty upon it is prohibitive, and this duty will be prohibitive also.

Mr. STONE. This glass is used, as I understand, for pictures and photographic purposes, and is not used for window glass in buildings. It is an imported glass. I will say to the Senator that the manufacturers of glass in different sections of the country who came before the committee stated, as will appear in some of their hearings, that they were indifferent as to what duty might be placed upon glass of this character, for the reason that it was not manufactured in this country for domestic use.

Mr. CUMMINS. What difference does it make what the manufacturers say about it? They are not making this bill; and I am sure the Senator from Missouri will not declare that none of this glass is used, because last year of the glass in this bracket, not exceeding 150 square inches, we imported more than 1,900,000 pounds. Why should we make it expensive to those who have to use it by putting a duty of this kind upon it?

Mr. STONE. What I said to the Senator was that this glass in these sizes is not manufactured in the United States, and I said that the manufacturers who filed briefs, or who were heard by the committee, gave the committee that information, and I think that is correct information. It is imported from Belgium and other foreign countries, but not for window glass, for it is not used as window glass to any considerable extent, and it is not competitive with anything produced in the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not accept the statement of the manufacturer if he declares that it is not used in this country for window glass. It is named "window glass" in the very language of the bill; and the Senator from Missouri does not mean to say that that class of window glass, 10 by 14 or 12 by 14, is not used in this country as window glass. I know by observation that that is not true.

Mr. STONE. I do not know to what extent it is true; but I do know that the information we had before the committee, upon which we rested our belief, was that the window glass of the size described in these brackets was not manufactured in the United States and was not used for window-glass purposes unless to a very limited extent. While the Senator says that he would not take the opinion of the manufacturers as to that, I give a good deal of credence to it for this reason, if for no other—

Mr. CUMMINS. I would take the statement of a manufacturer as to a fact, but I would not take his statement as to what duty ought to be put upon an article.

Mr. STONE. No manufacturer ever suggested a duty on this particular description of glass. On the contrary, those who conferred about it with me or with the committee stated that they were absolutely indifferent about the duty on that commodity.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then, I am sure the Senator from Missouri, if they are indifferent about it, will be willing to reduce the duty at least to about 40 per cent.

Mr. STONE. I am not willing to reduce it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Missouri is talking about one kind of glass and the Senator from Iowa about another. The Senator from Iowa calls attention to the first item, which

is unpolished window glass not exceeding 150 square inches, valued at not more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. The equivalent ad valorem rate on that glass is 73.53 per cent. The next bracket refers to the same sized glass valued at more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. That is the glass about which the Senator from Missouri is talking. The equivalent ad valorem rate on that is 28.57 per cent. That is the kind of glass which is used in framing pictures and in photographic work. The Senator from Iowa is correct in saying that glass not exceeding 150 square inches and valued at not more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, in the bill as reported by the committee, carries an equivalent ad valorem duty of 73.53 per cent. Very little of it is imported into this country, but it is made in this country.

Mr. STONE. Well, the Senator from Utah, as usual, makes his statement in a somewhat dogmatic form.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not intend to do so, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. He usually depends upon what the manufacturers tell him and quotes from them—

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. STONE. Very largely so; and quotes from them more than any other Senator here, or as much as any other Senator here. Now, he seeks to discredit what they say with respect to it. I should think that the men who make glass in this country would have some notion as to the uses to which glass is applied.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not disagree with me in this matter, as he will see if he will look at the bill as reported. I am perfectly aware that the glass costing over $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound is used in picture framing and photographic work, and of that kind of glass there are great importations—in fact, there were 15,632,000 pounds imported in 1912—but the glass about which the Senator from Iowa is talking is glass that is valued under a cent and a half a pound. The importations of that kind of glass are very small, and it is nearly all made in this country. The equivalent ad valorem at a cent a pound is 73.53 per cent, as the Senator from Iowa has stated.

I am not disputing the statement made by the Senator from Missouri that the glass under the second bracket, valued at over $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, is largely imported and is not made in this country to any considerable extent. The equivalent ad valorem on that glass is only 28 per cent.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope that I may be able to continue my discussion with the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Utah has very kindly interpreted what I said and has interpreted it correctly. I have been speaking about that kind of glass upon which there is a duty placed of 1 cent per pound, which amounts to 73 per cent of its value. I thought I made that perfectly clear to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I know what the Senator said, but I do not think he is correct in his statement.

Mr. CUMMINS. In what respect am I wrong?

Mr. STONE. And I do not think the Senator from Utah is correct in his statement of fact. The House committee combined the first two brackets of the paragraph, as found in the present law, and reduced the rate from $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound on the small-sized glass and $1\frac{3}{4}$ on the larger size, putting both at 1 cent per pound. That is a very material reduction on the existing rate. Inasmuch as we contend that this glass is an imported article, entering but little into competition with the domestic article, after making a reduction such as was made and considering the uses to which it is put, it is an entirely legitimate subject for a good revenue for the Treasury.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri, as it seems to me, attempts to defend an inordinately high duty by referring to the fact that the committee has reduced the duty upon some other article or an article of the same kind of a different class.

I repeat that plain window glass not exceeding 150 square inches in size is manufactured in this country and is used in this country by a great many people. The higher grades of glass that are above $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound in value, I agree, have been mainly imported. I am not dealing with them, however; and if the Senator from Missouri believes we do not manufacture much of this sort of glass and that there is substantially no competition upon it he is greatly in error. I can not think any manufacturer has so declared. If so, my information is altogether wrong.

But, however that may be, even for the sake of a revenue it seems to me we ought not to levy more than 40 or 50 per cent duty upon it. We are using it; every Senator knows we are using it. It is bought by the people who can not afford to buy high-priced glass. Yet we are putting, as we did before—and I am not distinguishing now between the Democratic majority and the former Republican majority—practically a prohibitive duty upon this kind of window glass, and I protest against it.

I did what little I could four years ago to prevent any such duty being imposed upon this article. As it was wrong then, it is wrong now. While the House provision does not entirely meet the demand of the times, it is better than the Senate amendment.

I therefore hope the Senate amendment in this particular will not prevail, because it is an increase over the House provision upon an article in general use—an increase that imposes a duty not required by any theory, principle, or doctrine of taxation.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, there is no doubt whatever that the duties levied upon what is known as ordinary window glass, measured from an ad valorem standard, are rather high, and with very good reason. There is no industry of any magnitude in this country that has been less profitable to its owners during the past 20 years than the manufacture of window glass. The reason for this is, in the first place, that it must be made by workers of great skill, and it is made in competition with a country where skilled workers can be obtained at less wages than in any other country in the civilized world except in the Far East. Belgium secures work involving skill at less wages than any other country in Europe, and it is a country that is keen to find a market for its goods. For that reason, if this glass is to be made in America and not in Belgium, it is absolutely necessary that what might appear to be a high duty shall be imposed upon it.

Pittsburgh was formerly the seat of most of the window-glass manufacture of the country. There is comparatively little of it made in the Pittsburgh district now; but it is made generally throughout the Middle West. There are factories in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and quite a number in Kansas. It is not a severe tax upon the people or upon the builders of houses. The item of glass is a very inconsiderable item in any house, no matter how large or how small.

When this matter was up for discussion four years ago I had before me the plans of a house which had been built the year before in the city of Pittsburgh, the contract price of which was \$4,200. All of the glass for that house was furnished delivered at the house for between \$11 and \$12. I make bold to say that if the glass had been imported under free-trade conditions the owner of the house never would have gotten it for so low a price as that.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take up time with the discussion of these matters. I do not think the duties provided in this paragraph are high enough. I have an amendment here I wish to offer, which I will ask the Secretary to read, and then I shall be willing to let the matter go to a vote without debate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Pennsylvania takes his seat, while I understand he believes this duty ought to be where it is or even higher—

Mr. OLIVER. Higher.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask him whether he perceives any justification for putting upon the glass included in the first bracket glass not exceeding 150 square inches, valued at not more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, a duty of 73 per cent, more than upon the glass included in the next bracket of the same size, but valued at more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, which carries a duty of 28 per cent; or more than upon glass included in the next bracket, which is glass above 150 square inches, but not worth more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, upon which a duty of 56.6 per cent is imposed; then dropping down on the next bracket to 32 per cent; then up on the next bracket again to 56.25 per cent? I ask whether he knows of any need of the trade or of the manufacturer that requires that discrimination or classification?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I am not standing here in defense of this bill. I think all of these duties ought to be higher. As far as the inconsistencies in the bill are concerned, I leave it to the Senators in charge to explain them. I do not propose to do it.

I ask for the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, is it true that the amendment of the committee is now pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know whether the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is an amendment of the committee amendment or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not well versed in parliamentary procedure, but my amendment proposes to change all of the duties in the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Chair rules that the committee has the right to perfect the paragraph before other amendments are offered.

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly willing to have my amendment voted upon later.

Mr. STONE. Let us have a vote on the committee amendment now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in lines 8 and 9, page 24.

Mr. CUMMINS. Upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been called for and ordered.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. STONE. I was going to make the point of no quorum, so that we might have a quorum present at the time the vote is taken.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will wait until the roll is called before I make the remarks I desire to make upon this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Bradley	Hitchcock	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Hollis	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Hughes	Page	Smoot
Bristow	James	Penrose	Stone
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	Swanson
Burton	Johnston, Ala.	Pittman	Thomas
Cañon	Jones	Poinexter	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thornton
Chilton	Kern	Ransdell	Tillman
Clapp	La Follette	Reed	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Robinson	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lea	Sheppard	Weeks
Crawford	Lewis	Sherman	Williams
Cummins	Lodge	Shields	
Dillingham	McLean	Shively	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN (at 3.17 p. m.). Mr. President, owing to the severe thunderstorm, which makes it impossible for Senators to be heard, I move that the Senate take a recess for 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate took a recess for 15 minutes; and at the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to paragraph 87.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like the attention, if I can have it, of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I listened with great interest to the discussion between the Senator from Iowa and the Senators from Missouri and Pennsylvania. The Senator from Missouri, if I understood him correctly, said that the duty in the first bracket on common window glass, unpolished, not exceeding 150 square inches, was levied for revenue and that there was very little of it manufactured in this country.

As I understand it, those are the small panes of window glass that are in common use, and we imported only 497,000 pounds in 1912. It seems to me that the importations must be very small. The duty under the present law, the Senator will observe, is 1½ cents per pound, or approximately 92 per cent ad valorem. The House reduced that to seven-eighths of a cent a pound, or approximately 64 per cent ad valorem. The Senate committee increases it to 1 cent a pound over the House rate, or 73 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would be sorry if the Senator from Kansas were misled by anything that I have said. Therefore I want to call his attention to the fact that the bracket which he is now mentioning is not the entire bracket covered by the 1-cent-a-pound duty. It is limited to glass 150 square inches or less, valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound. Another glass of the same size valued at more than 1½ cents a pound is found in the next bracket, where the duty retained by the Senate committee is only 28 plus.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; I understand. But I was going to inquire why the committee found it necessary to increase the duty on these small panes of glass while it did not increase the duty on the larger panes of glass found in the third bracket. The Senator will observe that in the third bracket under the present law the equivalent ad valorem is 96 per cent, while the House reduced it to 56 per cent and the Senate committee leaves it at that amount.

Going on down to the fifth bracket, where panes of glass contain 720 inches, the equivalent ad valorem is now 117 per cent. That is reduced by the House to 56 per cent, and the Senate committee leaves that at 56 per cent, being quite a radical reduction.

In view of the fact that the duties on the large panes are radically reduced I would like to know why the Senate committee increased the duty on the small panes. The Senator can not say that it is for revenue, because the revenue collected in 1912 on the importations of this bracket amounted to only a little over \$6,000, and the estimate of the Senate committee is for revenue only \$5,000. I have not been able to find out the basis upon which this increase is made.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the attitude of our friends on the other side is a rather strange one. Some of them complain that the reduction is too great, and some of them complain that it is not great enough. I understand the Senator from Kansas to insist that the reduction in the smaller sizes, the rates fixed in brackets 1 and 2, are too high, while in brackets 3 and 4 they are not high enough.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; my complaint was that the duties in bracket 1 are too high. The duties in bracket 2 seem to be reasonable. It is an approximate rate of 28 per cent. That is on the larger sizes.

Mr. STONE. No; brackets 1 and 2 are the same sizes.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is a higher priced glass of the same size.

Mr. STONE. They differ in price and value.

Mr. BRISTOW. I stand corrected as to the higher priced glasses.

Mr. STONE. The Senator then complains that the rate fixed in bracket 1 is too high?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. STONE. What does he say of bracket 2?

Mr. BRISTOW. The rate in bracket 2 seems to be very reasonable. It is only 28 per cent on the value.

Mr. STONE. It is the same rate per pound. What does the Senator say about brackets 3 and 4?

Mr. BRISTOW. It is 56 per cent in one instance and 32 per cent in the other. A reduction from 96 per cent to 56 per cent seems to be a pretty substantial reduction.

Mr. STONE. Then the Senator's complaint is confined to bracket 1?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; that is what I am complaining of now.

Mr. STONE. If we should reduce it to half a cent a pound, the Senator from Kansas would be satisfied?

Mr. BRISTOW. I think that half a cent a pound would be very much better than it is.

Mr. STONE. What about the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRISTOW. That is for the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Pennsylvania to settle between themselves. They seem to be in accord on this proposition.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. STONE. He said it is too low now.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Missouri listen to me for a moment?

Mr. STONE. Always.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the amendment proposed by the committee will not be adopted. If it is not adopted, I intend to offer an amendment reducing the rate on glass not exceeding 150 square inches and worth not more than a cent and a half a pound to one-half a cent per pound.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator will admit there is no value classification given here now.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not hear the Senator.

Mr. HUGHES. There is no value classification in the proposed bill. Consequently the Senator's amendment would not be germane as he states it. It would not harmonize with the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; but I intend to offer a value classification.

Mr. HUGHES. I see.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think that you can fairly attach a duty measuring it only by the pound when it is well known that the glass is of so greatly different value. That is evident here. We have two brackets of the same size of glass. Under

one, I think, the importations were valued at 1.4 cents per pound and under the other at more than 3 cents per pound. It is obvious that a duty of a cent a pound or any absolute sum per pound can not do justice to those two different kinds of glasses.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator suggests offering an amendment preserving the old value classification with reference to this commodity. I am not asking the Senator a question; I am simply making a statement with reference to this item. He suggests offering an amendment which will preserve in part a low value classification. Both the House committee and the Senate committee decided after full investigation that that sort of a classification is absolutely impossible.

I suppose this glass paragraph is one of the most difficult paragraphs in the whole bill. Under the old law, where there was a value classification, the testimony and the Treasury figures developed the fact that glass in this country was often sold for less than the face of the duty. A most peculiar competitive condition exists in the glass industry in this country now. Right at this time there is being installed a new glass-making machine which, so far as it has been installed, has absolutely revolutionized the whole glass-making industry. The value classification that the Senator suggests even now with the progress that has been made in the installation of this machinery would become absolutely worthless.

I wish to call the Senator's attention to this fact. These great variations between the equivalent ad valorem are misleading. You will notice that both the House and the Senate committees made very slight and gradual increases as they went along on the higher priced glasses in the specific duties. It is misleading to attempt to compare the equivalent ad valorem. You only get a fair knowledge of what both committees were trying to do when you look at the specific rates themselves, because there is no relation between the value of the glass and the price at which it is sold.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey why he did not pursue the general policy of the bill and attach an ad valorem duty to glass?

Mr. HUGHES. For the reason that we discovered that a great deal of the glass that falls under this first bracket is a by-product of the manufacture of other glasses, and, as in many other paragraphs in the bill, we found it almost impossible to ascertain the value, because this production is incident to the production of something else. A ridiculously high ad valorem rate would have to be laid upon the commodity in order to collect any duty at all.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume the Senator from New Jersey hardly means a by-product. What he means is that the manufacturers of other glasses find some pieces broken, and they are cut into smaller sizes.

Mr. HUGHES. Exactly. Great quantities of this glass are produced undesignedly, the manufacturer having something totally different in mind. This glass is on his hands and on the hands of the foreign manufacturer, too, and under an ad valorem rate it would be sent here in great quantities at very, very low values.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from New Jersey has said—and I am sure he is right upon that—that hitherto there has been a great deal of glass sold in the United States for less than the duty imposed upon it. Now, does not the Senator know that some four years ago, I think shortly after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill, there was a trust organized in the window-glass business?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. And it succeeded in putting up the price very greatly?

Mr. HUGHES. I used to be under the impression that the American Plate Glass Co. absolutely dominated the market, made a world of money, and had a very pleasant time generally.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator know—

Mr. HUGHES. But the information I received was that the American Plate Glass Co., over a very extended period of time, and the other American glassmakers in this country, habitually sold the product for less than it cost them to make it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely. Then we come to the making of this bill. You find a condition which you want to change. You change it by leaving a duty of 73 per cent on common window glass not more than 150 inches square. Does the Senator from New Jersey assert that there is no way in which justice can be reached concerning that commodity?

Mr. HUGHES. The difficulty is, the Senator and I will never get together if he keeps talking about ad valorem rates and I am speaking about specific rates of duty. I think there ought

to be a small specific duty on this glass for this reason: One of the biggest concerns in this country which makes it has a factory in Belgium. There is no doubt that glass can be made in Belgium more cheaply and more profitably and better, I think, than it can be made anywhere else in the world. The reason for that is that the glass manufacturers of Belgium have tremendous natural advantages. Of course, as the Senator knows, we did not go into the writing of this bill with the object of making a free-trade bill. As has often been said here, we were confronted by certain conditions.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the House put a duty of seven-eighths of a cent a pound upon glass not exceeding 150 square inches. What was wrong with that provision?

Mr. HUGHES. In the opinion of the committee it simply gave an additional advantage for the disposition of what is largely a by-product to a foreign—

Mr. CUMMINS. An advantage to whom?

Mr. HUGHES. To a foreign manufacturer. I was coming to that. One of the biggest concerns in this country has already established a factory in Belgium.

Mr. CUMMINS. How can a duty of seven-eighths of a cent a pound on glass of this size give a greater advantage to a foreign manufacturer than a duty of 1 cent a pound upon it?

Mr. HUGHES. I am trying to get to the point, if the Senator will permit me. Take the case of an American manufacturer who has a market in this country and selling agencies and means of distribution for this particular product and has also a large factory abroad. It was pointed out to me, I know—I do not know whether it affected the other members of the committee or not—it was pointed out to me by certain independent manufacturers in this country that an extremely low rate of duty would simply enable this American manufacturer to bring in the by-product of that factory and close his factory here or change its method of operation, and that the Government would simply lose that amount in revenue.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then the substance of all that is that the duty was raised to 1 cent a pound in order to protect the domestic manufacturers of this sort of glass. What I say is that that is too much protection.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator says it is too much protection because there is an equivalent ad valorem of 74 per cent, but the equivalent ad valorem is obtained by taking the price of glass, which is the most unfixed and variable proposition that I know of, and comparing it with these specific rates of duty, and it is absolutely and altogether misleading, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I agree to that. I agree that when you turn ad valorem duties into specific duties and separate the commodities into classes or brackets the lower-priced commodities will appear to have tremendous rates of duty.

Mr. HUGHES. Tremendous rates of duty.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is undoubtedly true. Therefore the bracket ought to be divided so that this range would be as small as possible.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that it is impossible to do it with a value classification, because the value of glass fluctuates to such an extent that that classification is really valueless. It is a difficult proposition. I do not mean to say that we have it exactly right, but we did the best we could with the information we had at hand. We started at this rate and we went up gradually and slowly and in an orderly way, increasing the specifics, knowing, of course, that any Senator could take a specific rate and change it to an ad valorem rate and show great variations in the different brackets. But that is caused, not by the rates that we propose to lay in this bill, but by the fluctuations of the glass market, the exigencies of the business, and the attempt on the part of this or that crowd to control the market at a particular time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey alluded to an American manufacturer who has a factory in Belgium. I am inclined to think that he is mistaken with regard to that having any application to this paragraph. I presume the manufacturer to whom he alludes is the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Mr. HUGHES. I think so. I know the representative told me himself—

Mr. OLIVER. The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. does not make any of this kind of glass.

Mr. HUGHES. They would be bound to make it in the manufacture of other glass.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon. Plate glass is an entirely different commodity from what is known as window glass.

Mr. HUGHES. My recollection is that he made that very point, and I asked him that question.

Mr. OLIVER. But I think it is with regard to a subsequent paragraph treating of plate glass and not with regard to this paragraph.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, Senators on the other side are not able to agree as to this rate of duty. Every day we hear complaints from that side that we want to ruin the country by having duties too low. Now, when we find some of them complaining that the duties are too high and that they ought to be reduced in the public interest, I feel very much inclined to give consideration to that remarkable expression of opinion. It may be we can reduce this rate somewhat. I do not say that it can be done or should be done; but since so many Senators on the other side think we have placed the rate too high, I will ask that the order for the yeas and nays be vacated and that the paragraph be passed over, and we will take it up and see if we can not accommodate our friends on the other side by a lower duty.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is very agreeable to me. I do not speak for any of my associates upon this side. I am sincere in the belief that the first bracket in this paragraph ought to be reduced below the rate named in the bill.

Mr. STONE. I understand the Senator's attitude. I am so much gratified at the disposition to lower duties that I will ask that the paragraph be passed over that the committee may look into it again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The call for the yeas and nays is withdrawn, and the paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was continued as follows:

88. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, not exceeding 384 square inches, 3 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 1,440 square inches, 7 cents per square foot; above that, 10 cents per square foot.

89. Fluted, rolled, ribbed, or rough plate glass, or the same containing a wire netting within itself, not including crown, cylinder, or common window glass, not exceeding 384 square inches, 1 cent per square foot; all above that, 1 cent per square foot; and all fluted, rolled, ribbed, or rough plate glass, weighing over 100 pounds per 100 square feet, shall pay an additional duty on the excess at the same rates herein imposed: *Provided*, That all of the above plate glass, when ground, smoothed, or otherwise obscured, shall be subject to the same rate of duty as cast polished plate glass unsilvered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have that paragraph passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over.

The Secretary read paragraph 90, as follows:

90. Cast polished plate glass, finished or unfinished and unsilvered, or the same containing a wire netting within itself, not exceeding 384 square inches, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 8 cents per square foot; all above that, 12 cents per square foot.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that that paragraph be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph goes over on the request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Secretary read paragraph 91, as follows:

91. Cast polished plate glass, silvered, cylinder and crown glass, silvered, and looking-glass plates exceeding in size 144 square inches, shall be subject to a duty of 1 cent per square foot in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable on such glass unsilvered: *Provided*, That no looking-glass plates or glass silvered, when framed, shall pay a less rate of duty than that imposed upon similar glass of like description not framed, but shall pay in addition thereto upon such frames the rate of duty applicable thereto when imported separate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask that paragraph 91 be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read paragraphs 92 and 93, as follows:

92. Cast polished plate glass, silvered or unsilvered, and cylinder, crown, or common window glass, silvered or unsilvered, polished or unpolished, when bent, ground, obscured, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, flashed, stained, colored, painted, ornamented, or decorated, shall be subject to a duty of 4 per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

93. Spectacles, eyeglasses, and goggles, and frames for the same, or parts thereof, finished or unfinished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on paragraph 93 and the succeeding paragraph I merely desire to say that the reductions which have been made are extremely serious, if not disastrous, to these industries. The cost of production of spectacles, optical instruments, and so on, as anyone will readily find, is chiefly labor. The raw material is not an expensive part of the cost. The labor costs are very much greater, from two to four times greater, in this country than they are among our competitors. I do not care to argue the matter at any length, but I ask leave to submit and have printed as a part of my remarks a letter from a constituent of mine, a very large maker of these articles, at Southbridge, Mass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission to do so is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., U. S. A., May 21, 1913.

OPTICAL GOODS.

(House bill 3321, Schedule B, pars. 93, 94, and 95.)

Hon. HENRY C. LODGE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have before us statements recently submitted to you by the United States Lens Co., the Tilton Optical Co., and the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. in connection with these goods, and desire not only to record our concurrence in the truth and importance of these statements bearing on the tariff question, but to emphasize the fact that the proposed reduction will seriously injure a legitimate business without benefit to the consumer.

The consumer will not benefit by a reduction in the tariff rates, because the cost of the article itself is included in a much greater charge for professional services and is almost negligible. A difference of \$1 a dozen would not show in the charge to the consumer, but would be extremely injurious to the manufacturer and the workman.

The workman and the manufacturer will be seriously injured, the reason being that the product as made in this country is from 70 to 85 per cent labor, and our labor cost is from two to four times greater than the labor cost abroad (Germany and France). Under the present rates the tariff is no more than competitive, and surely under these circumstances a one-third reduction in the tariff would be unwise and unsafe.

PERFECTION DEPENDS ON THE PERSONAL TRAINING OF THE WORKMAN.

The nature of eyeglasses and spectacles is such as to require the most delicate and accurate treatment, error being detrimental to the consumer. We know of no other industry where poor work on the part of the workman will show more quickly and be more injurious to the general public than in the preparation of accessories in the aid of eyesight. Commercial efficiency, furthermore, is obtained only by long years of careful training of the workman, years of patient care and endeavor to reduce the waste within practicable limits and secure the high grade of product manufactured.

If the industry were injured, it would take years to recover and the magnificent scientific progress of the art, which is tending to the betterment of the health and welfare of the consumer generally and fostered by wise and stringent optometry laws, would be stayed if not destroyed.

PRESENT PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE WITHOUT INCREASED COST TO CONSUMER.

Owing to the activity and research of our oculists and optometrists the scientific requirements have increased, with a consequent increase in cost of production. Wages and raw materials also in our art, as well as in others, have generally increased in the last few years; but in spite of the increase in scientific requirements and in wages the consumer is getting better goods than ever before without increased cost to himself; and this is solely due to the fact that competition has kept well apace, if not ahead, trade conditions being healthy and prices to the trade strictly regulated by open, well-developed competition.

PRESENT-DAY CONDITIONS ARE NOT THOSE OF YEARS AGO.

It would be impossible to build up a successful going plant to-day under the triple burden of high and increasing scientific requirements, high and increasing wages, and a reduced tariff, in view of the highly developed domestic competition now existing. A careful study of the experience of the present manufacturers will demonstrate this fact, and it is therefore earnestly hoped that the present rates will be retained, for it will not only benefit the workman and his employer, but will also benefit the general public.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERICAN OPTICAL CO.,
C. M. WELLS, President.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not, of course, know what the Senator from Massachusetts has asked to have printed, and I have no wish to have it read; but I wish to be informed about it.

Mr. LODGE. It is merely a letter setting forth in detail the points which I myself have briefly made as to labor costs, as to competition, and the general character of the industry. The letter comprises only a page and a half; it is a mere discussion of the rates of duty; that is all.

Mr. STONE. Very well.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I want to add a word to what has been said by my colleague [Mr. LODGE] in connection with this subject. This is one of the industries which has been built up in the United States, not so much as a result of the duty imposed as on account of the excellence of the product and the development of machinery in connection with the industry. Our manufacturers for the last 20 or 25 years have been in advance of the rest of the world in that respect. They have been closely followed and copied from time to time. Foreign manufacturers have agents in this country who are trying at all times to copy or to conform to the methods which have been in use here.

The duty of 50 per cent which has hitherto prevailed has probably not had a great influence in developing the industry, and if conditions in the future were to be what they have been in the past a reduction to 35 per cent might not materially injure the industry; but conditions have so changed that now our foreign competitors have reached a point where they can manufacture as cheaply and develop a product as good as that manufactured in this country.

The rate of duty is an extremely small item in the total cost of an eyeglass. If a person goes to an oculist, pays three or four or five dollars for his opinion, and then goes to the dealer in eyeglasses, the price of the glass depends very largely on the

personal service performed by the dealer rather than the value of the glass. For instance, the glass which I have in my hand [exhibiting] would probably be sold by the manufacturers for not more than \$3 a dozen, or 25 cents a pair, and yet the total cost to myself, including the fee to the oculist, was \$7.50.

I want to give two or three of these figures, because they illustrate what a small item the duty is in the total cost. The duty under the prevailing law on glasses that cost 40 cents a dozen is 26 cents a dozen; on glasses that cost \$1.50 a dozen, it is 75 cents a dozen; the duty on glasses that cost \$3 a dozen is \$1.50 a dozen. The reduction proposed would make the duty, instead of 26 cents a dozen, 14 cents a dozen; the duty proposed, instead of 75 cents on the next grade, would be 32 cents; on the next grade, instead of being \$1.50 a dozen, it would be \$1.05 a dozen. In the lowest grade it would be a difference of 1 cent a pair; on the next grade it would be a difference of 2 cents a pair; and on the next grade it would be a difference of 4 cents a pair.

Nobody can contend that that is going to have a great influence in affecting the price to the consumer when the cost of his glasses has been several dollars paid either to the oculist or to the dealer in glasses.

But the point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that the industry abroad has reached a state of perfection equal to that in this country, and we take great chances when we reduce duties under these circumstances, duties which are not burdensome on the consumer in this country under present conditions, and in cases where we make a reduction which is not going to bring any compensating advantage to the consumer. Nobody can tell just what the result will be in this case. It may not make any material difference for the time being, but it is opening the door to the possibilities of a serious change.

This industry has been developed after long experience and is an expensive industry to develop, because every workman engaged in it has to go through a long course of training in order to reach a stage of perfection which enables our manufacturers to put out the quality of product which they have done. Therefore I think it is inadvisable to make any change in a schedule of this kind which is not going to bring any advantage to anybody and which may be of serious disadvantage to every manufacturer and every workman engaged in it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move to amend paragraph 93 by striking out "35" and inserting "45." I do not believe in the ad valorem system, but that is the nearest I can bring it—

Mr. STONE. The present ad valorem rate is 51 per cent in the brackets.

Mr. LODGE. I want to make it as high on the equivalent as the specific makes it. I will ask to make it 45 per cent. The present duties are specifics and these are ad valorems.

Mr. STONE. The duty was reduced by the House bill from "51" to "42.35" per cent. The fact is that in 1912 there were only sixty-three thousand and odd dollars worth of importations, as against a domestic production in 1910 of \$11,734,000 worth. On these optical goods, I think, 35 per cent is certainly enough.

Mr. LODGE. I move to make the rate "45 per cent."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 93, page 26, line 15, before the words "per cent," it is proposed to strike out "35" and to insert "45."

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 94, page 26, line 20, after the word "manufactured," to strike out "30 per cent ad valorem" and to insert "strips of glass, not more than 3 inches wide, ground or polished on one or both sides to a cylindrical or prismatic form, including those used in the construction of gauges, and glass slides for magic lanterns, 25 per cent ad valorem," so as to make the paragraph read:

94. Lenses of glass or pebble, molded or pressed, or ground and polished to a spherical, cylindrical, or prismatic form, and ground and polished plano or coquill glasses, wholly or partly manufactured, strips of glass, not more than 3 inches wide, ground or polished on one or both sides to a cylindrical or prismatic form, including those used in the construction of gauges, and glass slides for magic lanterns, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 27, to strike out paragraph 95, as follows:

95. Strips of glass, not more than 3 inches wide, ground or polished on one or both sides to a cylindrical or prismatic form, including those used in the construction of gauges, and glass slides for magic lanterns, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 27, line 6, to change the number of paragraph "96" to "95," in line 6, on the same page, after the word "glasses," to strike out "telescopes, microscopes, photographic and projection lenses, and"; in line 7, after the word "optical," to strike out "and surveying"; in line 8, after the word "frames," to strike out "or" and insert "and"; and in line 10, before the words "per cent," to strike out "30" and insert "35," so as to make the paragraph read:

95. Opera and field glasses, optical instruments and frames and mountings for the same; all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 10, to insert as a new paragraph the following:

96. Surveying instruments, telescopes, microscopes, photographic and projection lenses, and frames and mountings for the same, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read paragraph 97, as follows:

97. Stained or painted glass windows, or parts thereof, and all mirrors, not exceeding in size 144 square inches, with or without frames or cases; incandescent electric-light bulbs and lamps, with or without filaments; and all glass or manufactures of glass or paste or of which glass or paste is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have that paragraph passed over for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 98, page 27, line 22, after the word "Fusible," to insert "and glass," so as to make the paragraph read:

98. Fusible and glass enamel, 20 per cent ad valorem; opal or cylinder glass tiles or tiling, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read paragraphs 99 and 100, as follows:

99. Marble, breccia, and onyx, in block, rough or squared only, 50 cents per cubic foot; marble, breccia, and onyx, sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness, 75 cents per cubic foot; slabs or paving tiles of marble or onyx, containing not less than 4 superficial inches, if not more than 1 inch in thickness, 6 cents per superficial foot; if more than 1 inch and not more than 1½ inches in thickness, 8 cents per superficial foot; if more than 1½ inches and not more than 2 inches in thickness, 10 cents per superficial foot; if rubbed in whole or in part, 2 cents per superficial foot in addition; mosaic cubes of marble or onyx, not exceeding 2 cubic inches in size, if loose, 20 per cent ad valorem; if attached to paper or other material, 35 per cent ad valorem.

100. Marble, breccia, onyx, alabaster, and jet, wholly or partly manufactured into monuments, benches, vases, and other articles, or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, and all articles composed wholly or in chief value of agate, rock crystal, or other semiprecious stones, except such as are cut into shapes and forms fitting them expressly for use in the construction of jewelry, not specially provided for in this section, 45 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRISTOW subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to ask that paragraph 99 be passed over, because I have observed one or two duties in the paragraph into which I should like to look a little further.

Mr. JAMES. It is impossible to hear what the Senator says.

Mr. BRISTOW. I say I should like to have paragraph 99 go over with the other paragraphs that have gone over, because I desire to look into some of the duties contained in that paragraph.

Mr. JAMES. In regard to surveying instruments?

Mr. BRISTOW. No; in regard to marble, onyx, and surveying slabs.

Mr. STONE. The Senator refers to paragraph 99.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. STONE. We have no objection, of course, if the Senator wishes that paragraph passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to the end of paragraph 101, which is as follows:

101. Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, lava, and all other stone suitable for use as monumental or building stone, except marble, breccia, and onyx, not specially provided for in this section, hewn, dressed, or polished, or otherwise manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished, 3 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the member of the committee having this matter in charge what consideration moved the committee in reducing the rate of duty upon granite from 50 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. GALLINGER. And the duty on unmanufactured granite from 10 cents to 3 cents per cubic foot?

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator refer to marble?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The paragraph covers freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and so forth, but I am asking particularly in relation to granite.

Mr. STONE. That is the rate fixed by the House bill.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. But, perhaps, the committee can tell us upon what ground the reduction was made and what reasons were presented to it in the hearings why the reduction should be made.

Mr. STONE. It was reduced by the House one-half, from 50 per cent to 25 per cent, because the House presumed that the reduction was a proper one in the interest of the consumer and of the revenue.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have examined the House hearings, but have been unable to find that anybody recommended it, excepting Mr. Hanold, who represented the firm of Townsend, Townsend & Co., of 423 West Twenty-first Street, New York City. Mr. Hanold said that, in appearing before the committee, he represented the "National Wholesale Granite Dealers' Association, comprising 18 firms engaged in the business of selling domestic and imported granite monuments at wholesale," and so forth.

If anybody else appeared before either the House or the Senate committee recommending this reduction or giving any reason for it, I should be glad to know who it was.

Mr. STONE. I was just about to say that I do not recall that anyone appeared before the Senate committee in relation to this item; but my attention is now called to the fact that a granite manufacturers' association of Quincy, Mass., filed a brief.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes; but they were opposed to the proposed reduction.

Mr. STONE. Yes; they were opposed to it.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Now, I am asking upon what consideration the recommendation was made that the rate be reduced? Who asked for it?

Mr. STONE. Just upon the ground that it was thought that the rate was unnecessarily high and should be reduced. There are practically no importations.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Does the Senator recall anybody except the band of importers in New York represented by Mr. Hanold who recommended the reduction?

Mr. STONE. I know nothing about "the band of importers" of whom the Senator speaks. They did not appear before the Senate committee.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No; but Mr. Hanold says he represented 18 firms engaged in importing granite.

Mr. STONE. No; I do not know who appeared.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Well, Mr. President, I do not think that anybody else appeared before the House committee demanding a reduction in the rate.

Mr. STONE. I do not think any person interested in quarrying or manufacturing marble or granite appeared before either committee to insist upon a reduction of the duties. I think not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think not, too. No consumer in the United States asked for it, so far as I have been able to find by an examination of the record of the hearings. I do not think that anybody asked for it, except the importing companies in New York, and they recommended that the duty be reduced from 50 per cent to 20 per cent.

Mr. STONE. That may be so, if the Senator please. I do not know.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In connection with this matter I want to call the attention of the Senate—

Mr. STONE. But I can not see how that affects the question of whether the reduction should have been made.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Perhaps I can help the Senator to see that, because I think that a very great injustice has been done in this instance.

Mr. STONE. I am not asking to be helped.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that the granite output of the country that goes into monumental work is disposed of almost entirely by the class of firms that came and asked for this reduction, and they have—

Mr. STONE. Are they importers?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes; they are importers and also dealers in the domestic article.

Mr. STONE. Well, now, will the Senator let me call his attention to the fact at this pertinent point in his statement that I find on looking at the data before me—official statistics—that in 1912 of all the articles mentioned in the paragraph, freestone, granite, and so forth, only \$74,991 worth were imported—

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I was aware of that fact.

Mr. STONE. While there was a domestic production of these articles in 1911 of \$76,966,000.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I was aware of those facts.

Mr. STONE. Then, if the tariff would affect the question of importation of these heavy materials—in other words, if they are likely to be brought in any considerable quantity from abroad, the tariff was prohibitive, and it has been reduced one-half by the House bill. With a domestic production of over \$76,000,000 against an importation of \$74,000, and with a tariff either prohibitive in itself or which added to the cost of transportation from abroad makes it prohibitive, I rather think the House has not overleaped the bounds of wisdom in making the reduction.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I can not find that either the House or the Senate committee has made any inquiry to ascertain what would be a fair competitive rate of duty upon this article. I would not stand here to ask for a prohibitive duty, but I do think that the duty should be equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad; and it is to that question that I desire to address myself to the Senate for a moment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me just a word?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Gladly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is aware of the fact that there is the most intense domestic competition in the production of granite. It is produced in several of our New England States and in other parts of the country, and the competition is so keen that there is really very little profit in that industry. I agree with the Senator from Vermont that the reduction proposed to be made is a violent reduction and that it will result in greatly reducing the domestic production and increasing the importations of the product.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I was about to remark, Mr. President, that the class of firms that have come here and asked for this reduction substantially control the granite trade of the United States. I am referring now to the monumental trade, into which granite so largely enters. They employ artists to prepare designs, which are numbered, and every one of these firms has perhaps a hundred or a thousand different designs. They have their subagents all over the United States. Whenever they hear of a death in a family their agent immediately seeks an interview, submits prices upon which they will furnish different styles of monuments composed of this, that, and the other variety of granite, foreign and American. Having secured the contract for a monument, they submit plans and specifications for the same to different producers of granite in Vermont, in New Hampshire, in Maine, and in other parts of the country, and in the competition among the manufacturers for the job they secure the lowest possible price. In that way they have brought about the brisk competition which has been mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. So that the price of granite monuments is probably as low in this country to-day as it ever can be under the prices which the manufacturers are compelled to pay for wages in that industry. This is shown by the fact that the business is not in the hands of a trust. It is entirely in the hands of individual producers.

I live in the center of the granite industry in Vermont, and it is one of the largest industries of the State. The census reports show there are 51 quarries in operation in Vermont; that 21 of them are controlled by individuals, 12 of them by partnerships, and only 18 by corporations. It will, therefore, be seen that the business is not under the control of any trust nor of any combination whatever, but that it is an individual enterprise in every instance, and the competition that I have mentioned is always maintained.

The cost of producing granite and placing it on the market is almost wholly labor; and that is a matter that ought not to be overlooked. According to the report of the last census the element of labor entering into the cost of finished granite is given as at 80 per cent of the whole.

In the manufacture of granite the hours necessarily have to be short. They are universally eight hours a day for granite cutters. The minimum wage paid there is \$3.25, and the daily wage is increased according to the skill of the person employed to \$4.50 and in some instances to \$5 per day.

Probably 2,000 persons are employed as cutters in this industry. I suppose that in the stone industry of Vermont there are 10,000 persons engaged. They are highly skilled workmen and command a high rate of remuneration. If the American manufacturers, paying these prices for labor, are to be driven into competition with foreign producers, where, as in Scotland, the average rate of wages is only 15 cents an hour, while with us the minimum rate is \$3.25 a day, Senators can see what that competition means.

In Barre, which is in the county where I reside, there are 104 concerns engaged in manufacturing granite, after convert-

ing the stock into monuments and selling them in all parts of the United States, largely through the firms in New York to which I have already called attention. In Montpelier there are 21, and in the towns of Hardwick and Bethel there are 74, making 199 in all. The minimum rate of wages paid, as I have stated, is \$3.25 a day, or 40¢ cents per hour, while in Scotland the same work commands only 15 cents an hour, or \$1.35 for a nine-hour day.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I assume his figures as to wages in Vermont and Scotland to be correct. I can not assail them, because I do not know where he obtained his data.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I obtained my information to some extent from the census but more largely from inquiry.

Mr. STONE. As to the Scotch rate?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The Scotch rate comes to me from two different sources. I have it from Mr. Wishart, who is the secretary of the Granite Manufacturers' Association at Barre. I find it also given in a brief that has been filed with the committee, to which the Senator has called my attention, by the Quincy (Mass.) Granite Manufacturers' Association. In that brief, which the Senator mentioned a little while ago, they say:

Monuments are a luxury, and the principal item in the cost of production is labor. We pay our granite cutters and granite polishers a minimum wage of \$3.25 per day, many of our workmen getting \$4 or \$4.50 per day. In Scotland the pay is \$1.35 per day. Our workmen have already given warning that as fast as existing agreements expire they will expect and demand a minimum wage of \$4 per day. Without a tariff sufficient to offset the difference between what we pay and what is paid in Scotland it means Scotch monuments in our cemeteries instead of native monuments.

Mr. STONE. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am reading from a communication filed with the committee by the Granite Manufacturers' Association of Quincy, Mass., to which the Senator from Missouri called my attention a few moments ago.

Mr. STONE. Very well. It is but natural, and not improper, that manufacturers and others who have interests to promote before Congress should state their case as strongly as possible. They say that they pay some of their workmen as high as \$4 a day. Then they give the average of the Scotch rate as \$1.35. I should like to know a little more definitely, from less interested concerns, just what the average wage would be in this employment.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think I can speak with authority on that subject. I live in the center of the largest granite industry in the United States. The rate of pay there is fixed by agreement between all of the manufacturers and all of the workmen. It is entered into year by year. The present agreement between them is equivalent to \$3.25 a day. The minimum rate is 40¢ cents per hour. That is the equivalent of \$3.25 per day for an eight-hour day. It is the union rate, and they are compelled to pay it. I have neighbors within a stone's throw of my house who are skilled laborers, who get \$4 and \$4.50 a day for their work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I chance to live in a city one of the chief industries of which is granite. The granite in the Congressional Library building came from my home town. The granite used in the first story of the Senate Office Building came from my home town. I know that the scale of wages that the Senator from Vermont says is being paid in Vermont is precisely the scale of wages that is being paid in Concord, N. H. It is the union scale.

I have no knowledge as to the rate paid in Scotland, except that it has been stated to me by parties who claim to know that the rate is as the Senator from Vermont has stated.

Mr. STONE. Can the Senator from Vermont tell me the cost of transportation, cutting, and so forth?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The ocean freight rate is low. I will say in reply to the Senator that this Mr. Hanold, representing these importing firms in New York, made a computation, which he filed with the committee, on different classes of monuments, giving the price for which he thought they could be brought into New York under the proposed duty and what would be asked by the American manufacturers, delivered free on board the cars at the quarry, but not in New York. The Granite Manufacturers' Association of Quincy, Mass., have taken that table, and on page 291 of the documents relating to Schedule B, second print, they have compared the figures. They say that taking a monument costing \$16 imported from Scotland, as represented by the gentleman to whom I have referred, it would cost \$20 to put one of the same character free on board cars at Quincy from Quincy

granite; that a monument that would cost \$118 imported can not be reproduced in Quincy granite and delivered on the cars at Quincy for less than \$134.

That is the statement of the Quincy Manufacturers' Association, which is a very reputable one, as the Senator from New Hampshire will be able to assure you.

I do not want the Senator to understand that I am opposing any reasonable rate of duty, but I insist that in an industry as large as this, one furnishing employment to such a large number of men, and in which 80 per cent of the cost of the product is labor, it is an absolute injustice to the men who have made the necessary investments, it is an absolute injustice to the industry and all who are dependent upon it, to open up competition with Scotland in such a way that wages must necessarily be reduced or the output curtailed. I do not think our friends on the other side want to do that. I do not think they want to make such a record.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Very gladly.

Mr. HUGHES. I am informed that a very great proportion of the granite produced in this country is polished at the various penitentiaries throughout the country. Has the Senator any information as to that?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not think that is the case.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think there is a foot of it.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Not a foot of granite produced in Vermont is polished in penitentiaries.

Mr. LODGE. Not a foot of the Massachusetts granite is polished in penitentiaries. Our laws do not permit it.

Mr. HUGHES. Not in Massachusetts, not in my State, not perhaps in the State of Vermont, but in States where under the law convicts are permitted to labor for private contractors.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator please state what State he refers to?

Mr. HUGHES. My information is that in the State of Indiana a great deal of American granite, quite a considerable percentage of the total production, is polished by the convicts in the penitentiaries.

Mr. LODGE. It is rather hard to make Massachusetts and Vermont and New Hampshire all suffer for that.

Mr. HUGHES. I state that only as bearing upon the general labor conditions throughout the country, and as bearing upon the question of the tremendously high rate of wages paid in this industry.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, of course, it does not reduce the rate of wages in the New England States, where we are paying and are compelled to pay union rates.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that; but the rate of wages in the State of New Hampshire, or any other New England State, is affected, of course, if there is anything in the Senator's argument, by the cost of production by convicts.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator indicate what proportion of the granite that is produced in this country is polished in penitentiaries?

Mr. HUGHES. My information is that it is a very large proportion; but my information is not sufficiently accurate for me to venture a statement as to the proportion.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator must be mistaken.

Mr. HUGHES. I will promise to make an investigation and state the result of it to the Senator in due time. I can not do it now.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the figures "25," in line 1, page 29, be stricken out and that "50" be inserted, that being the present rate.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, before that motion is put, I desire to submit a letter on this subject from the board of trade of the city of Quincy, which I should like to have read as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

QUINCY BOARD OF TRADE,
Quincy, Mass., May 13, 1913.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WEEKS: Realizing that any reduction in the duty on granite will be disastrous to our city, it was unanimously voted at a meeting of the Quincy Board of Trade on May 7 to urge upon the Government at Washington that every effort be made to prevent a reduction of that duty.

Upward of \$2,000,000 is involved in the granite plants and industry in Quincy. We have 130 firms engaged in that business, employing 1,600 workmen, with an average pay roll of \$25,000 weekly.

At the time that the duty on granite was only 30 per cent our stonecutters were walking the streets with nothing to do, and we earnestly hope that such a condition will not be repeated.

Respectfully,

JOHN O. HALL, Secretary.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, it will be noticed that as far as the character of the industry is concerned, that statement bears out the statement which has been made by the Senator from Vermont. An industry employing a capital of \$2,000,000 has connected with it 127 different firms, and they are all in active competition with one another, so there is not anything resembling in any sense a trust or a combination in the industry.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator one question before he takes his seat. If I heard correctly the reading of the document which was sent to the Secretary's desk, it said that when there was a duty of 30 per cent upon granite the people of that town were walking the streets without employment. What time does that refer to—the time when the Wilson bill was in effect?

Mr. WEEKS. I suppose it refers to the time the Wilson law was in effect. I did not look it up.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Wilson bill duty is 30 per cent, so I suppose it refers to that; but I find that the importations under the Wilson bill were only about \$300,000 annually. It does not seem as if importations of \$300,000, with the enormous production in this country, would throw everybody out of employment.

Mr. WEEKS. Under the operation of the Wilson bill nobody could buy monuments anywhere; it did not make any difference how cheap they were.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was too expensive to die then.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the old gag that we have heard so frequently that it has lost its force and meaning to intelligent people—not meaning, of course, any reflection.

I want to call the attention of the Senator also to the fact that according to the report of the Geological Survey on "The mineral resources of the United States" for the year 1911 there seem to have been produced in the country 21,391,878 tons of granite, and I find that under the present rate last year there was imported into this country only \$140,000 worth of granite.

The present rate would seem to be, speaking relatively, an absolutely prohibitive rate. I hope the Senator is not contending for a prohibitive rate. I hope the Senator is not contending that we ought to have a law with reference to this product of his State, which means that nobody on the outside is to be permitted to import any granite into this country.

That is the present condition. That is practically what the present law means. We are reducing the duty just one-half in the hope that it may bring about some competition.

If the Senator will permit me, I will ask him one other question. From whence does the Senator fear competition in this business?

Mr. WEEKS. I naturally fear competition from the only other point where granite which would enter into competition with our domestic product is mined and perfected, and that is in Scotland. The fact is, Mr. President, that I am quite familiar with the figures which the Senator has read, and it does seem as if there was relatively a prohibitive duty on granite. But the figures which he read need some explanation, because a very large percentage of that granite—quite likely 95 per cent; I do not know just how much—enters into the building trade and not into the trade that is in competition with this trade at all. It is not so much a question of a duty on the raw granite as it is of a duty on the finished product, although both involve a large percentage of labor.

The main point, however, is just what has been so well stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], that this duty is being reduced 50 per cent without any information whatever being in the hands of the Finance Committee. There is no demand from anybody to reduce it 50 per cent or 40 per cent or 25 per cent. It is possible that if the subject were investigated it might be demonstrated that a reduction of 10 or 15 or 20 per cent might be made and increase foreign competition. There is ample domestic competition now. But no investigation has been made. Simply an arbitrary reduction of 50 per cent has been made, and it may be seriously damaging to an important industry.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I wish to ask him whether he knows what is the freight rate on granite coming from Scotland to this country?

Mr. WEEKS. I have seen the figures, but I have not them before me just at this minute.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator ask the transportation rate?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. From Scotland?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Some of it has been brought in ballast. I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am talking about the rate on the finished granite, the polished granite.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it is safe to say that when we transport a monument, for instance, from Concord, N. H., to Boston, 100 miles, by rail, we pay a rate certainly as large as the water rate from Scotland to Boston.

Mr. SIMMONS. If you have to import it from Scotland, it comes and is landed at Boston; and if then you want to send it 100 miles inland you have to pay the additional rail rate, do you not, on the monument?

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not quite understand him.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator said the freight rate on a finished monument from Boston 100 miles into the interior was so much.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. If that same monument was imported from Scotland, was landed at Boston, and was destined for this point 100 miles from Boston, in addition to the ocean transportation the importer would have to pay the transportation to the interior, would he not?

Mr. GALLINGER. The foreign product would be largely sold in our large cities and we would pay the land transportation for 100 miles. If we wanted to get to New York, we would have to pay the land transportation two hundred and thirty-odd miles more by rail or else by water. So I think the matter of transportation can not be urged as against the domestic product.

It is a fact that granite has been brought to this country from Scotland in ballast, and if this violent reduction is made I have no doubt that pretty much all of it will come here at a rate as low as we can get transportation, and that the trouble certain Senators have because we are manufacturing so much in this country will be solved and American capital and American labor will be wiped out, to a very considerable extent, for the benefit of the producers of granite in Scotland, and to some extent in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina will look at the brief he has in his hand—

Mr. SIMMONS. What brief does the Senator refer to? I do not know what brief he is talking about.

Mr. WEEKS. I refer to the only information the Finance Committee has on the subject, and that is the brief filed by the Granite Manufacturers' Association of Quincy, Mass. The Senator will find on the last page of that brief that the price of Scotch or Swedish granite, free on board the dock in Boston and New York, for various classes of monuments, averages something like 15 or 20 per cent less than the local price on board the cars in Quincy, Mass., at this time.

For instance, in Exhibit A, the foreign granite is \$16; the Quincy granite on board the cars is \$20. In Exhibit B it is \$24 as against \$26; and so on down through the list.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is from what point?

Mr. WEEKS. That is granite that is imported from either Sweden or Scotland in competition with Quincy granite.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is talking about the rough granite, is he not, that is brought over as ballast?

Mr. WEEKS. I am talking about monuments.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator makes a mistake when he says that is the only brief I have. The brief I have in my hand is a brief not filed with the Finance Committee at all, but filed with the Ways and Means Committee. I will read part of it to the Senator:

Mr. HANOLD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not Mr. William M. Dodd. Mr. Dodd telegraphed me to represent him.

The CHAIRMAN. Give your name and address to the stenographer.

Mr. HANOLD. My name is Frank J. Hanold, of Townsend, Townsend & Co., 453 West Twenty-first Street, New York City. I might also say that you have allotted me from 3.40 to 3.50 p. m. on behalf of my own firm. In what I have to say as representing the wholesale granite dealers I will cover ground on behalf of my own firm at the same time, and it will be unnecessary to give me that time this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. What paragraph are you interested in?

Mr. HANOLD. Paragraph 114.

On behalf of the National Wholesale Granite Dealers' Association, comprising 18 firms engaged in the business of selling domestic and imported granite monuments at wholesale, I respectfully recommend that section B, paragraph 114, of tariff act of August 5, 1909, be amended by reducing the tariff on manufactured granite mentioned in said paragraph from 50 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem.

The present rate of 50 per cent ad valorem is prohibitive to that extent, that the cost of imported granite monuments is far in excess of the cost of the same article of domestic manufacture, so that the importation of granite monuments has diminished, resulting not only in preventing the imported article reaching the consumer of moderate means, but must have resulted in decreased revenue to the Government.

That seems to be the statement of the representative of the national association, representing 18 firms engaged in the manufacture of monuments in this country.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to another point that has

been omitted in the discussion of this matter, and that is where the larger part of the competition is likely to come from under this lower tariff.

Like my colleague, I live in a section very near the granite quarries. My colleague lives in the vicinity of Barre and Montpelier, while I live near Hardwick and Woodbury. I am very closely connected with the granite people there. When this matter came up I asked them where they thought their hardest and keenest competition would come from. They said: "We think not, perhaps, from Scotland, but from Canada." I said to them: "What is there in Canada that you must compete with?" They said that on the border line between Vermont and Canada, at a place known as Beebe Plain, there was a very extensive quarry; that the same class of granite that we produce in Vermont extends into the edge of Canada, and at Beebe Plain there is a very vigorous concern. In order that we might know more about that competition, I wrote and ascertained that the cost of labor there was \$2.25 per day, and that the men were nonunion men and worked nine hours per day. In Vermont, as my colleague has said, everything is under the unions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator a question. Is the rate he has just given the wage paid to those who polish the stone, or is it the wage paid in the quarries?

I ask the Senator that question because it seems to have been pretty well understood here, in the discussion we have had about the relative wage scale in Canada and in this country, that there is practically no difference. They are the same kind of people that we are. They live in a prosperous country, as we do. They have the same standard of living over there that we do, and the wage scale, as a rule, is the same over there. If it is not the same in this particular industry, then it would seem to be an exception; and if there is a difference so near the border, if the difference were very great, the men would probably come across the line and work in the mines in the Senator's State, instead of working in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator certainly has a false idea in regard to the scale of living in Canada and the scale of wages paid there. You can almost see the difference in the civilization as you go across the line from Vermont into Canada. The houses are poorer, the churches are fewer, the schools are poorer, the scale of living certainly is different. There is no question about that. The Senator has only to travel there to recognize it. I live only about 35 miles from the line, and this quarry at Beebe Plain is probably 40 or 45 miles from my place. I have been there. Now, I will give the Senator my authority.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has not yet told me whether he was referring to the wages paid in the quarries or the wages paid to the polishers.

Mr. PAGE. I will read what I have here from Charles H. Wishart, secretary of the Granite Manufacturers' Association of Barre. He says:

The quarry owners also employ nonunion help, and I understand a first-class quarryman gets \$2.25 per day for 9 hours.

He does say, in addition to that—I want to be perfectly fair about it—that they advertise there to pay from 29 to 38 cents per hour in Canada.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was the wage paid in the quarries in Canada. The Senator gave us a little while ago not the wage paid in the quarries in this country, but, as I understood, the wage paid to the polishers that polish the monuments. Now, can the Senator tell us the wage paid in the quarries in his State?

Mr. PAGE. My colleague has taken up the question largely of monumental work, but I want to address myself to the particular fact that the wages in this country were certainly more than 25 per cent in Barre than just across the line, on the Boston & Maine road, the same road in which these quarries are pretty much all situated in Vermont, and that in addition to the one hour of extra service per day they are not under union rule; and he says that when a man breaks a piece of granite there in that quarry he is compelled to pay for it. They have to have a great deal better scale in all the details for a union worker on this side of the line than they have for a union worker on the other side.

Now, speaking with reference to the polished granite, I want to ask the Senator—

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask what are the wages paid in the quarries in Vermont?

Mr. PAGE. The minimum wage in Vermont is \$3.25.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the quarries?

Mr. PAGE. The granite cutters in Barre, Vt., have a minimum wage rate of \$3.25 per day, although many are paid as high as \$5 per day.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am talking about the quarries. I was trying to get the rate paid in Canada and the rate paid here.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say that as between the wages in Vermont and the wages in Canada I am assured that the wages in Vermont are at least 25 per cent higher than they are just across the line in Canada.

Mr. SIMMONS. If that be so, the 25 per cent allowed in this bill would amply cover the difference between the rates paid here and in Canada.

Mr. PAGE. But I should like to hear what the Senator says when he takes the bill and reduces the duty from 10 cents a cubic foot to 3 cents. Is there any other schedule that is reduced in that way? Why do you go to Vermont to select out that industry?

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought the Senator was talking about monuments, and that rate is reduced from 50 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. PAGE. I understand, Mr. President, that the rate on finished granite is as stated by the Senator; but I should like to ask why, because it all comes under the same schedule, they have taken Vermont's leading product and reduced the duty from 10 cents to 3 cents per cubic foot in the last part of paragraph 101.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let us see about that. The rate on monuments, not dressed, hewn, or polished granite, is 10 cents now. In 1911 the entire importation into this country amounted to only \$3,185. It was almost prohibitive, almost to the point of absolute exclusion.

Mr. PAGE. I want to speak with the Senator with very great candor about that, because I have taken this question up with our people at Hardwick, who make very largely building stone. The Hardwick Granite Co. furnished the stone for the Union Station here. They are now furnishing the stone for the new post-office building here. They say to me that when there is active business everywhere the Canadian quarries are occupied in the manufacture of goods for their own market, and the Americans have the American market; but the moment there is any dullness in trade the Canadians can manufacture this stock, the rate on which you have reduced from 10 cents to 3 cents per foot, so as to drive them out of the market in spite of all they can do. They may be wrong about it, but they tell me that in all candor, and I believe that they believe what they say.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me call the Senator's attention to a fact. He says when there is a dull time the importations are very great. I have understood the Senator and his colleagues on the other side as contending that there was not great prosperity in this country in 1896. At that time, when there were dull times according to your contention, there were imported into this country under the Wilson rate only 65,000 cubic feet, valued at only \$21,000.

Mr. PAGE. But the Senator has not understood my question. Why has he selected this Vermont industry, and whereas you make an average reduction of only 27.4 per cent, why have you taken this industry and made a reduction of 70 per cent?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will find, if he will follow these schedules and paragraphs, innumerable instances where we have found a situation like this. In cases where there were no importations we have made reductions of 66⅔ and 70 and 80 per cent. This is not an exception at all.

Mr. PAGE. Can the Senator name to me any industry as large as the granite industry, certainly as large as that industry is in proportion to the other industries of Vermont, where any such reduction as 70 per cent has been made?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. And an industry where 80 per cent of the production is labor.

Mr. SIMMONS. On the articles we were discussing yesterday, pumice stone and other things, the reduction was as much as that. A large part of this granite is building material. It is not used altogether for monuments; it is a building material. The Senator has just said that the magnificent station down here was built out of granite from his State. The use of that is as a building material, and all through this bill where an article was used for building purposes and purposes of that character we have been not simply reducing duties, but we have been putting them on the free list.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from North Carolina think it would have been desirable that the Union Station should have been built of Scotch granite?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; and I think we only imported last year about \$30,000 worth of Scotch granite. It would take about a hundred years at that rate to get enough here to build the Union Station.

Mr. GALLINGER. But if you reduce the duty one-half and open our markets to all the countries of the world—

Mr. SIMMONS. You can put this article on the free list and there will be practically no importations.

Mr. GALLINGER. I challenge the Senator to furnish the least scintilla of proof of that assertion.

Mr. SIMMONS. There are a great many heavy articles like this put on the free list, and there will not be any great increase in the importations.

Mr. GALLINGER. If that be so, is it wise to disturb the present rate? If putting it on the free list is not going to do any good, let the present rate remain. It will not do any harm.

Mr. SIMMONS. There will be some little importations, and we will get some little revenue from it.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator referred to the Vermont granite which appears in the Union Station here. We are very proud of our granite in Vermont. There is probably nothing in the world that equals the Bethel white which has gone into the construction of the post-office building here. I am very glad that has been referred to. When we commenced a few years ago we were down near the bottom of the list in regard to the production of granite. I think it was only a few years back as 1907 when we stood third or fourth in the list of granite-producing States. About 1910 we reached the second place, and in 1911 or 1912 we took the first place, and I think, perhaps, we are leading even more than formerly in the proportion of granite which we produce. We are very proud of it.

But I want to say when you take this industry, which is one of our leading industries, and reduce the duty 70 per cent—from 10 cents per foot to 3 cents per foot—I think you are doing us a great wrong.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I think this debate has served to distract attention from the provision in the first portion of paragraph 101. In what I had to say in opening I addressed myself to that portion of the paragraph which provides that—

Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, lava, and all other stone suitable for use as monumental or building stone, except marble, breccia, and onyx, not specially provided for in this section, hewn, dressed, or polished, or otherwise manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Granite such as that which is being employed in the construction of the new post-office building comes in blocks, and that is what my colleague [Mr. PAGE] probably refers to as being competitive, in that it can be produced in Canada and be made available from that source. But when we come to monumental work the stone that goes into that work here comes mainly from Scotland. I want it distinctly known that when you have reduced the rate ad valorem from 50 per cent to 25 per cent, 80 per cent of the production being labor, you have put the labor of the Vermont cutter upon a basis where it is in danger and where it must necessarily be reduced if this rate is adopted.

The question of competition was suggested by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], the competition which comes through the men who want to import it. If you go into a Massachusetts or a Vermont community and see how the business is done, you will find a large number of individual cutters, men who have come right out from the ranks of workmen. They are Scotch, Italians, and Americans. They are men of individual character and initiative. They have started little industries and they get their work through the New York firms. Competition between them is extreme. It is that branch of the industry, and conducted in that way, that you are attacking in this measure. It is not a very large corporation or any combination of capital, but it is the small manufacturer.

Now, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment that I offered, if I may be permitted to do so, and I will offer an amendment covering both passages in the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont withdraws his prior amendment and submits an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 28 strike out paragraph numbered 101 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

101. Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and all other monumental or building stone, except marble, breccia, and onyx, not specially provided for in this section, hewn, dressed, or polished, or otherwise manufactured, 50 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished, 10 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. STONE. That is the present law.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to say only a single word about one point that was made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I am aware that it is a waste of time to go into the question of labor cost. The differences of cost were not considered by the committee in making up these duties. They frankly put them aside. I admit that to consider comparative labor costs in production here and abroad is a difficult and complicated thing to do. It is much simpler to look at the amount of importations of last year of a given article, which only requires ability to read the statistical returns, and say, "Why, there is a great deal or there is very little.

If very little, the duty is prohibitory, and we will cut the rate down; and if there is a great deal we will cut it so much." That system has much that can be said for it. It is a simple and a labor-saving system.

But when the Senator from North Carolina characterizes the statement made by the secretary of the Quincy Board of Trade that the workmen in the Quincy quarries and granite shops were walking the streets when the duty was low, at 30 per cent, as an old gag, that may be one way of disposing of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to withdraw that word. I regretted it the minute I used it. I did not desire to do such a thing.

Mr. LODGE. I am obliged to the Senator. I only wanted to say in regard to that that whatever the cause at that time, the period when those rates of duties were in force was a period of very great industrial depression in my State as in others. The Quincy granite workers, like the workers in the woolen mills and all other industries, were largely unemployed; many stone-cutters' yards were closed; there was a great deal of distress.

Of course, the importation of \$300,000 worth of granite did not throw the Quincy workmen out of employment. There would have been a great deal more granite imported if anybody had had any money to spend on monuments. But when people are in distress and there is grave doubt as to where they are to get money to buy food they have a tendency to save on monuments. That is not one of the necessities of life that they think of buying first. The business fell off, of course, when the community was in distress, and work was scarce, and people were economizing in every direction. The monument industry was one of the first to feel it, because, I will not say luxuries of that kind, but things of that kind are the first that people attempt to economize on. The result, of course, of this economizing in monuments was to produce great distress among the granite workers of Quincy and, I have no doubt, of Concord and of Vermont. The amount of imported granite did not increase very much; relatively to the total production of the United States it was a small amount.

The place where the competition would come with severity if this great reduction is made would, of course, be along the coast. I have no idea that Scotch granite will compete seriously with the granite which the Senator from New Jersey has told us is polished by convict labor in Indiana. I do not believe they will need fear any competition from the Scotch yards, but on the coast of New England, on the coast of New York, the great market of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and all along this coast, which is densely populated, and where there is a very large market for articles of that description, owing to the density of population and also as a distributing point, of course the competition will be immediate and direct, because the ocean rates are extremely low, and a good deal is brought in ballast, as the Senator from New Hampshire said. Some years ago I had occasion in a tariff discussion to look into this matter with some care, as we have very large granite quarries in Quincy, and I found that the ocean rates on granite were almost negligible when it came to the question of competition.

The industry which is thus exposed to competition has been described so thoroughly and well by the Senators from Vermont, my colleague, and others who have taken part in the debate that it is not necessary for me to go into it. But I wish to emphasize the fact that the granite industry, in New England at least, is carried on by innumerable small manufacturers. There are some corporations, but comparatively few. They are men who come up, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] says, who have a small business, and competition is intense. They work entirely on the union scale of wages. The whole industry is unionized, from the men who take it out of the quarry up to the men who do the last work in carving and polishing the monument, who are a very highly paid class of labor. I know of scarcely any article in this entire tariff bill in the production of which American labor is brought so directly in competition with foreign labor. The margin of profit is extremely small and the wages are high. I think that should be considered in fixing the rate of duty on this particular article.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I desire to say a few words in reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 28 it is proposed to strike out paragraph 101 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

101. Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and all other monumental or building stone, except marble, breccia, and onyx, not specially provided for in this section, hewn, dressed, or polished, or otherwise manufactured, 40 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished, 8 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is a proposed reduction of 20 per cent from the present law, and as a matter of justice to this industry it is all the reduction that ought to be made.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has called attention to the fact that the Wilson law had a duty of 30 per cent on this article, and that under that there were no importations. That is true. During that period, whatever the cause may have been, the people were asking for bread and they were not willing to accept a stone, and especially a foreign stone, as a substitute. The people then did not purchase foreign granite nor did they purchase domestic granite to any very considerable extent.

Mr. President, this is an industry, as has so well been said by others, that is subject to the keenest possible domestic competition.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from New Hampshire overlooks the fact that the American people did then buy several times as much as they did last year under the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not quite understand the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said that the Senator from New Hampshire overlooked the fact that under the Wilson law the people of this country did import from abroad more than twice as much as they did last year under the high rates of the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; undoubtedly; because they had a 30 per cent duty. Now, if you give them a 25 per cent duty they will import still more, which will put out of work American artisans and reduce the production of American granite. If you make the rate 20 per cent, you will put out of employment more American workmen, if that is what you want to do. All you have to do is to reduce the duty still further, and you will accomplish your result beyond peradventure.

Mr. SIMMONS. What the Senator from New Hampshire wants to do is to make it impossible for any granite to be brought in here, and what we want to do is to make it possible for some to be brought in.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Hampshire does not propose anything of the kind, and yet the Senator from New Hampshire will say that it never disturbs him when American artisans are employed and when American manufacturers, who have invested capital, are getting a fair return upon it.

I repeat, there is the keenest possible competition in the production of granite. Some years ago Mr. Batterson, of Hartford, came into my own State and invested a quarter of a million dollars in a plant for the manufacture of granite. Bids were asked for the Congressional Library in Washington. Citizens of the State of Maine wanted the contract; citizens of the State of Vermont wanted it; citizens of the State of Massachusetts wanted it; and Mr. Batterson, desiring to erect that great building of Concord granite, which is certainly as good granite as there is in the world, made a bid which was accepted and which resulted in a loss to him when he constructed that building. When it was decided to build the lower story of the Senate Office Building of granite Mr. Batterson's son, who had succeeded to the business, made a bid for the granite which did not net him a single dollar of profit, to my knowledge. He did it for the reason that citizens of Massachusetts, of Vermont, of Maine, and possibly of other States were competing for that work.

I say to Senators on the other side of the Chamber that this is an exceptional item in this bill. There is 80 per cent of labor in every cubic yard of granite that goes into a building or into a monument. It is not fair offhand to reduce this duty 50 per cent. It will undoubtedly result in tremendous foreign importations; it will undoubtedly result in placing the granite manufacturers of this country in an attitude where they will either have to curtail their production or reduce the wages of their operatives, which will be very difficult to do, because the labor unions absolutely control the wages in that great industry.

Mr. President, I now offer an amendment that proposes to reduce the duty 20 per cent. It is a fair reduction; it is a large reduction; but I am hopeful that the industry can stand that reduction; at least I am quite willing that it shall be tested. I think our Democratic friends ought not to resist this amendment, because it proposes as large a reduction by and large as has been made in the bill which is now under consideration. I shall

have to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, because I am indulging the faint hope that it may prevail, and that the Senators on the other side of the Chamber may see that it is a proposition that is fair, and that they ought not to strike what I consider will be practically a deathblow at an industry so important to at least four New England States, and which, in my judgment, will be very seriously affected if the duty proposed in this bill becomes a law.

The proposition is a just one, a fair one, a generous one; and while I know that our Democratic friends hesitate to change any rate that they have reported in the bill, yet there are times when justice and fairness require that we shall yield our opinions and our convictions, when facts are presented such as we have endeavored to present in connection with this item. That is all I care to say about it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] speaks somewhat flippantly and disparagingly of the action of the House committee and of the Senate committee by saying that they just offhand adopted this rate. I hardly think the Senator is justified in that statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I said that for the reason that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] had stated that the literature on the subject does not show that the matter was gone into by either of the committees thoroughly or carefully. The Senator from Missouri will understand that I did not mean to impute any motive to those who have the bill in charge on the other side that they purposely did the wrong thing. I did not mean that at all; but I meant to imply that they had not gone into this matter with as much care and thoroughness, investigating the difference in the labor cost between this and other countries and the proportion of labor which is found in manufactured granite, as they might have done.

Mr. STONE. I did not understand the Senator as trying to be offensive at all, but rather as indicting the Democratic side, as he has now explained, for lack of proper attention to the details.

Mr. President, I have just a word or two to say in response. One manufacturer at least came before the Senate committee and filed a brief. He was opposed to any reduction of the rate whatever and undertook to show that it would endanger the industry. The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] read from a brief filed before the Ways and Means Committee by, I think he said, 17 men who were engaged in selling for monumental purposes marble and granite of American production and probably of European production, and that they were interested in getting a lower rate of duty so that they might avail themselves in some way of the foreign production in their business. Those 17 men are in a sense the agents of the purchasers.

Mr. SIMMONS. Seventeen firms.

Mr. STONE. Well, the 17 firms are in a sense the agents of the purchasers, because they are the users of the productions of the quarries of New England and elsewhere in the country. These matters, I am sure, were considered by the Ways and Means Committee when they fixed that rate; but here stands the one great insurmountable and indisputable fact, that under the rate of 50 per cent ad valorem, or about that, practically no imports of this commodity have been brought into the country, and the domestic producers have an absolute monopoly of the business. The rates imposed, plus the freight charges, have been prohibitive.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, in the face of these facts and in this situation, the committee was well warranted in saying this industry could not be injured by cutting the duty in two. Of course, no one wishes to injure a great industry in this country, and particularly in New England, but I believe that we ought to deal justly with the people who are purchasing marble, granite, and other kinds of stone, not only to build monuments over their dead, but for purposes of construction and in the industrial employment of the Nation.

I think the amendment ought not to be agreed to and that the House rate should stand.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator, Mr. President, if he does not think that a reduction of 20 per cent is likely to produce a sufficient influx of foreign granite? How large a proportion of the domestic production does the Senator want wiped out for the benefit of Scotland or any other country?

Mr. STONE. I do not want to wipe out anything.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, it must necessarily do that if the foreign granites come in here as a matter of inundation under this very low rate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, as to how much will come I do not know, and neither does the Senator from New Hampshire know, nor does any other Senator; but I should think that if a fairly good proportion of the consumption of this country came from abroad it would not destroy our industry.

Mr. GALLINGER. But that will mean that a fairly good proportion of the men who are now employed will be dismissed and will have no employment.

Mr. STONE. I do not believe that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STONE. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what is the price per cubic foot for granite?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am unable to answer that question, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. Can either of the Vermont Senators answer it?

Mr. PAGE. It is about 50 cents in Vermont.

Mr. STONE. Fifty cents per cubic foot at the quarry.

Mr. GALLINGER. It would seem to me, Mr. President, that the majority members of the Finance Committee ought to be able to answer that, if they have investigated the matter.

Mr. STONE. But the Senator is criticizing what the committee did, and I am asking now upon what basis of information the criticism is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I will ask the Senator if it would make any difference what the price per cubic foot is so far as the rate of duty is concerned?

Mr. STONE. Well, what is the foreign price?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know that. What difference does that make, so far as the rate of duty is concerned?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that the unit price per cubic foot is 44 cents.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is that the foreign value?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; that is the foreign value.

Mr. STONE. Forty-four cents is the foreign price. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] says it is 50 cents in Vermont. There is a very small difference in percentage between 44 cents and 50 cents.

Mr. OWEN. The freight would cover that.

Mr. STONE. As the Senator from Oklahoma says, the freight would cover that, to say nothing of the 25 per cent ad valorem duty.

Mr. GALLINGER. We do not admit that there is any difference in the freight rate. I think it is in favor of the foreigner rather than in favor of the domestic producer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. JAMES. What is the question, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay." As it is, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], whom I do not see in the Chamber. I will transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. WARREN] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber on public business and that he is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], which I transfer to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN. I inquire if the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator. In his absence I withhold my vote. If he were present and I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THORNTON. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent on account of serious illness in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Cummins	Lodge	Smoot
Brady	Dillingham	McLean	Sterling
Brandeggee	Gallinger	Nelson	Townsend
Bristow	Gronna	Oliver	Weeks
Burton	Jones	Page	Works
Catron	Kenyon	Penrose	

NAYS—41.

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Johnston, Ala.	Ransdell	Stone
Bankhead	Kern	Robinson	Swanson
Bryan	La Follette	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lane	Shafroth	Thornton
Chilton	Lea	Sheppard	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Shields	Walsh
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Shively	Williams
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Hughes	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
James	Owen	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—28.

Burleigh	Fletcher	O'Gorman	Sherman
Clapp	Goff	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Gore	Perkins	Stephenson
Crawford	Jackson	Pittman	Sutherland
Culberson	McCumber	Polindexter	Thomas
du Pont	Newlands	Reed	Tillman
Fall	Norris	Root	Warren

So Mr. GALLINGER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this is a matter of extreme regret to me. I give notice that when the bill is in the Senate I shall offer an amendment to this paragraph, hoping that in the meantime my Democratic friends will look into this matter very carefully and see if they are not really making a reduction altogether too violent in the case of this American product.

Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays on the paragraph itself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are taken I should like to say just one word as to the phraseology. I want to call the attention of the Senator who has this portion of the bill in charge to the wording of the paragraph itself. Then I ask him to turn to paragraph 616, the paragraph under the free list.

In paragraph 101 "freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone," and so forth, "unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished," are dutiable at 3 cents per cubic foot. Now, if the Senator will turn to paragraph 616 of the bill—

Mr. TOWNSEND. The same bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The same bill—he will find that the words "freestone, granite, and sandstone" are included in that paragraph, and are not included in the present law. They are made free under paragraph 616.

Does not the Senator think there is a conflict there? The bill says "cliff stone," and then it adds "freestone, granite, sandstone," and they are on the free list under that paragraph, whereas under paragraph 101 it says "unmanufactured, * * * 3 cents per cubic foot."

I wish to say that in paragraph 101 the bill refers to "freestone, granite, sandstone * * * suitable for use as monumental or building stone." In the free paragraph it uses the words "not suitable for use as monumental or building stone." I desire to ask the Senator, if it was unmanufactured, under paragraph 616, coming in free, how would it be known whether or not it was suitable for monumental stone?

Mr. STONE. One Senator suggests one thing to me and one another. That the general appearance of the stone would determine the matter is one answer. Another is that the common sense of the appraisers in looking at it would determine whether or not it was fit for such use.

Another thing, Mr. President. I think the criticism is hardly warranted—

Mr. SMOOT. I was asking the Senator for his opinion on that matter. I do not offer it as a criticism. I ask the Senator

because it seems to be left in such a position that it would have to be judged as to whether or not the stone was suitable for monumental stone.

Mr. STONE. I think we can very well leave it as it is.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, may I ask what paragraph of the free list that is?

Mr. SMOOT. Six hundred and sixteen.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from New Hampshire to inform the Chair as to the right, in reading the bill in Committee of the Whole, to call for the yeas and nays on an unamended paragraph.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it seems to me that if the demand is made a vote should be had on a contested paragraph, and that it is entirely proper to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, I think that would not be according to the usual practice; but I suggest that the Senator would accomplish the same purpose by moving to strike out the paragraph. That would result in getting a vote on it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am inclined to think the Senator from Georgia is right in the suggestion. I adopt it, and move to strike out the paragraph, on which I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the last vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. As I see he is not present, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. As he is not present, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. THORNTON (when Mr. O'GORMAN's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLE] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OVERMAN. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—12.

Bradley	Burton	Gallinger	Oliver
Brady	Catron	Lippitt	Penrose
Brandegee	Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Smoot

NAYS—52.

Ashurst	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	James	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Jones	Pittman	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pomerene	Stone
Chilton	Kern	Ransdell	Swanson
Crawford	La Follette	Robinson	Thompson
Cummins	Lane	Saulsbury	Thornton
Dillingham	Lea	Shafroth	Townsend
Gronna	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Shively	Walsh
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Williams

NOT VOTING—32.

Bankhead	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Goff	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Clapp	Gore	Perkins	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Poindexter	Thomas
Cole	McCumber	Reed	Tillman
Culberson	McLean	Root	Warren
du Pont	Myers	Sherman	Weeks
Fall	Newlands	Shields	Works

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to paragraph 101:

In line 1, page 29, strike out "25" and insert "35"; in line 2, page 29, strike out "3" and insert "6."

Mr. President, as it is now the time for adjournment, I trust that this amendment will go over, to be considered to-morrow. I want Senators to dwell upon this matter and ask themselves seriously the question whether the reduction that I now propose is not a fair reduction.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he will not permit the remaining two paragraphs of the schedule, which are very short, to be read?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. If there is any objection to them, they will go over. I think there will be no objection to them; they can be read, and we will finish the reading of the schedule to-night.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection, except I wish paragraph 101 to go over with my amendment pending.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

102. Grindstones, finished or unfinished, \$1.50 per ton.

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to be heard briefly on this paragraph. I prefer to have it go over.

Mr. JAMES. We will take it up to-morrow.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let it go over. Let the Secretary read the next paragraph, and we will see if there is any objection to that.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

103. Slates, slate chimney pieces, mantels, slabs for tables, roofing slates, and all other manufactures of slate, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 31, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30, 1913.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Col. William T. Russell, Corps of Engineers, to be Chief of Engineers, with the rank of brigadier general, from August 12, 1913, vice Brig. Gen. William H. Bixby, Chief of Engineers, to be retired from active service.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Henry T. Mayo to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 15th day of June, 1913.

Commander Henry F. Bryan to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1913:

Alexander M. Charlton,
Archer M. R. Allen,
Paul E. Speicher,
Andrew D. Denney,
James C. Van de Carr,
Maurice R. Pierce,
William R. Purnell,
James D. Smith, and
Guy C. Barnes.

John D. Lane, a citizen of Vermont, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 21st day of July, 1913.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1913:

Thomas B. Holloway, a citizen of Pennsylvania, and
Louis Lehrfeld, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

First Lieut. Lauren S. Willis to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of May, 1913.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

C. E. Brooks to be postmaster at Fort Deposit, Ala., in place of William S. Smith, resigned.

Clifford T. Harris to be postmaster at Columbia, Ala., in place of Henry J. Godfrey, resigned.

W. G. Porter to be postmaster at Heflin, Ala., in place of John W. Kitchens. Incumbent's commission expires August 5, 1913.

ARKANSAS.

John F. Hunt to be postmaster at Mammoth Spring, Ark., in place of Bryant W. Ford, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Norman P. Cormack to be postmaster at Wasco, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Frederic S. Harrison to be postmaster at Patterson, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

William K. McFarland to be postmaster at Jackson, Cal., in place of Henry E. Kay, resigned.

COLORADO.

F. W. McIntyre to be postmaster at Akron, Colo., in place of Mary A. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1913.

FLORIDA.

Thomas C. Fletcher to be postmaster at Lake Butler, Fla., in place of Henry O. Brown, resigned.

E. W. Irvine to be postmaster at Lake City, Fla., in place of David B. Raulerson, removed.

GEORGIA.

Gilbert B. Banks to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Ga., in place of Siegfried Schwarzwelss. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1913.

Custis Nottingham to be postmaster at Macon, Ga., in place of Harry S. Edwards, removed.

ILLINOIS.

Michael P. Bergen to be postmaster at Gillespie, Ill., in place of John F. Ahrens. Incumbent's commission expired May 13, 1913.

W. H. Clear to be postmaster at Mount Pulaski, Ill., in place of Warren J. Lincoln. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

W. G. Cloyd to be postmaster at Bement, Ill., in place of G. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

J. E. Jontry to be postmaster at Chenoa, Ill., in place of A. O. Rupp, declined.

Cleve B. Schroder to be postmaster at Vermont, Ill., in place of George Kirkbride, declined.

Myrtle E. Smith to be postmaster at Depue, Ill., in place of Frank Fry, resigned.

Philip H. Sopp to be postmaster at Belleville, Ill., in place of Louis Opp, resigned.

J. V. Sperry to be postmaster at La Harpe, Ill., in place of Isaac F. Landis. Incumbent's commission expires August 4, 1913.

INDIANA.

Charles H. Ball to be postmaster at La Fayette, Ind., in place of George P. Haywood, removed.

M. E. Maloney to be postmaster at Aurora, Ind., in place of William H. Hathaway, removed.

Michael Scanlon to be postmaster at Boswell, Ind., in place of William S. Leffew, resigned.

IOWA.

William A. Cooper to be postmaster at Bayard, Iowa. Office became presidential April 1, 1913.

Charles Daniel Huston to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in place of W. G. Haskell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1913.

Otho C. McShane to be postmaster at Springville, Iowa, in place of James M. Burroughs, resigned.

C. S. Shanklin to be postmaster at Marion, Iowa, in place of J. S. Alexander, resigned.

John S. Sloan to be postmaster at Williams, Iowa, in place of Charles M. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

KANSAS.

Mildred K. Johnston to be postmaster at Meade, Kans., in place of James I. Stamper, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

S. F. King to be postmaster at Winchester, Ky., in place of John G. White, resigned.

J. D. McCoy to be postmaster at Greenup, Ky., in place of C. F. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1913.

H. H. Poage to be postmaster at Brooksville, Ky., in place of Henry C. Metcalfe. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1913.

LOUISIANA.

Lear Mary Hesser to be postmaster at Bonami, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1913.

MAINE.

Joseph E. Brooks to be postmaster at Biddeford, Me., in place of Charles E. Atwood. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Arthur L. Newlon to be postmaster at Buckfield, Me., in place of Alfred Cole, deceased.

Albert F. Donigan to be postmaster at Bingham, Me., in place of Fred W. Preble. Incumbent's commission expired June 9, 1913.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Patrick Curran to be postmaster at Scituate, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1913.

MICHIGAN.

John La Belle to be postmaster at Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

J. F. Matthews to be postmaster at Croswell, Mich., in place of Frank J. Battersbee, resigned.

William J. Nagel to be postmaster at Detroit, Mich., in place of Homer Warren, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

H. E. Hoard to be postmaster at Montevideo, Minn., in place of Lewis O. Norheim. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1913.

Emil A. Kurr to be postmaster at Sauk Rapids, Minn., in place of John Burski. Incumbent's commission expires July 30, 1913.

George Lien to be postmaster at Granite Falls, Minn., in place of Mary J. Dillingham. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

MISSISSIPPI.

B. F. Lott to be postmaster at Collins, Miss., in place of Eugene E. Robertson, removed.

John R. Mennier to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., in place of James C. Tyler, removed.

B. Y. Rhodes to be postmaster at West Point, Miss., in place of Edward Dezonla, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

John S. Callan to be postmaster at Odell, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

James W. Carson to be postmaster at Edgar, Nebr., in place of J. J. Walley. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1912.

Frank C. Cooney to be postmaster at Overton, Nebr., in place of John A. Schleaf. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

William T. Cropper to be postmaster at Sargent, Nebr., in place of S. L. Perin. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1912.

Charles P. Davis to be postmaster at Bladen, Nebr., in place of William L. Bennett, resigned.

Joseph J. Heelan to be postmaster at Mullen, Nebr., in place of Richard R. McKinney, resigned.

Isaac T. Merchant to be postmaster at Adams, Nebr., in place of H. L. Watson, removed.

George W. Norris to be postmaster at Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of George H. Borden. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

C. F. Smith to be postmaster at Elwood, Nebr., in place of Albert W. Searl. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1913.

C. R. Tweed to be postmaster at Bassett, Nebr., in place of C. E. Stockwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

NEW JERSEY.

Henry N. Gillon to be postmaster at Berlin, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

NEW MEXICO.

John A. Haley to be postmaster at Carrizozo, N. Mex., in place of Arthur Jay Rolland, removed.

NEW YORK.

William A. Hosley to be postmaster at Belmont, N. Y., in place of George M. Horner, removed.

Frank E. Ingalls to be postmaster at Brownville, N. Y., in place of Fernando H. Reeves, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. T. Dick to be postmaster at Mebane, N. C., in place of S. Arthur White, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John M. Baer to be postmaster at Beach, N. Dak., in place of J. Wells Brinton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1913.

F. F. Burchard to be postmaster at University, N. Dak., in place of Thomas G. Johnson, resigned.

P. J. Filbin to be postmaster at Steele, N. Dak., in place of H. B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

Robert A. Long to be postmaster at Drayton, N. Dak., in place of Levi W. Patmore. Incumbent's commission expires August 5, 1913.

J. H. McLean to be postmaster at Hannah, N. Dak., in place of Charles B. McMillan, resigned.

Myrtle Nelson to be postmaster at Bowman, N. Dak., in place of William H. Workman, removed.

W. W. Smith to be postmaster at Valley City, N. Dak., in place of William H. Pray, removed.

OHIO.

John Palsgrove to be postmaster at Canal Winchester, Ohio, in place of Harry H. Dibble. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1913.

William J. Prince, sr., to be postmaster at Piqua, Ohio, in place of Joshua W. Orr, deceased.

James Sharp to be postmaster at Nelsonville, Ohio, in place of Pearl W. Hickman, resigned.

F. C. Thomas to be postmaster at Malta, Ohio, in place of Charles A. Tracy. Incumbent's commission expires August 4, 1913.

Robert T. Whitmer to be postmaster at Thornville, Ohio, in place of Solomon Rousculp. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1913.

OREGON.

Charles W. Ray to be postmaster at Freewater, Oreg., in place of J. C. Pritchett. Incumbent's commission expired June 14, 1913.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Robert H. Gracey to be postmaster at Glenside, Pa., in place of Sylvester C. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Oscar E. Letteer to be postmaster at Berwick, Pa., in place of Jennings U. Kurtz. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

B. K. Arnold to be postmaster at Woodruff, S. C., in place of Roberta McAulay. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

Nevitt Fant to be postmaster at Walhalla, S. C., in place of E. M. Sloan, resigned.

Richard W. Scott to be postmaster at Jonesville, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

F. A. Nutter to be postmaster at Alcester, S. Dak., in place of Horace M. Green. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1913.

Frank Wall to be postmaster at Selby, S. Dak., in place of Fred deK. Griffin, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

John T. Clary to be postmaster at Bellbuckle, Tenn., in place of William A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

TEXAS.

Allie M. Erwin to be postmaster at Loraine, Tex., in place of Irvin W. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1913.

Cora Dell Fowler to be postmaster at Lockney, Tex., in place of Homer Howard. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1913.

W. B. Junell to be postmaster at Cumby, Tex., in place of Charlie Smith. Incumbent's commission expires August 5, 1913.

R. C. Matthews to be postmaster at Palestine, Tex., in place of George W. Burkitt, jr., resigned.

Rufus W. Riddels to be postmaster at Electra, Tex., in place of Arthur N. Richardson, resigned.

Carrie E. Smith to be postmaster at Marble Falls, Tex., in place of Effie J. Cochran. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1911.

N. E. Tucker to be postmaster at Mercedes, Tex., in place of Henry A. Appel, removed.

VIRGINIA.

Thomas Hall Davis to be postmaster at National Soldiers' Home, Va., in place of John C. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

WASHINGTON.

W. E. Overholt to be postmaster at Farmington, Wash., in place of Jacob Blickenderfer, deceased.

A. J. Shaw to be postmaster at Zillah, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1913.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Charles M. Brandon to be postmaster at Follansbee, W. Va., in place of Mary Hateley. Incumbent's commission expired June 9, 1913.

Charles M. Brown to be postmaster at Mount Hope, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

O. C. Dawson to be postmaster at Janelew, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

WISCONSIN.

G. W. Bishop to be postmaster at Wonewoc, Wis., in place of Amanda Price. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1913.

George Burke to be postmaster at Thorp, Wis., in place of George B. Parkhill, resigned.

William H. Campfield to be postmaster at Hancock, Wis., in place of Frank J. Wiley. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

Nicolaus Elmer to be postmaster at New Glarus, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

George B. Keith to be postmaster at Milton Junction, Wis., in place of Charles S. Button. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1913.

John T. Lee to be postmaster at Corliss, Wis., in place of James W. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

Louis Locke to be postmaster at Shiocton, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

John H. Moller to be postmaster at Bruce, Wis., in place of George M. Carnahan. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

George Paquette to be postmaster at Shullsburg, Wis., in place of William Kuelling. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Simon Skroch to be postmaster at Independence, Wis., in place of Joseph M. Garlick. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

Franklin C. Watson to be postmaster at Owen, Wis., in place of Thomas H. Wylie. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 1913.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

William J. McGee to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at San Francisco, Cal.

SUPERINTENDENT OF MINT.

Thaddeus W. H. Shanahan to be superintendent of the mint at San Francisco, Cal.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Ed E. Leake to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of San Francisco, Cal.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John P. Carter to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William H. Martin to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Alice B. Bussey, Cuthbert.
H. O. Crittenden, Shellman.

INDIANA.

Ernest E. Forsythe, Washington.

KENTUCKY.

F. A. Casner, Providence.

OHIO.

D. C. Brown, Napoleon.
W. W. Daniels, Leroy.
Custer Snyder, Lorain.
Charles G. Stroup, Lynchburg.
Clate A. Wagner, Kenmore.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles H. Carter, Mount Pocono.
Andrew C. M. Crozier, Port Royal.
J. B. Esch, Spangler.
Henry W. Rinehart, Millerstown.
John J. Ryan, Centerville.

WASHINGTON.

Guy A. Hamilton, Leavenworth.

WISCONSIN.

Adolph H. Dionne, Lena.

T. J. Griffin, Prescott.

John P. Rice, Sparta.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 30, 1913.

POSTMASTERS.

OHIO.

T. O. Armstrong to be postmaster at Middle Point, in the State of Ohio.

Albert M. Sigle to be postmaster at Calla, in the State of Ohio.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 31, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, in presenting petitions in behalf of the joint resolution designed to result in the amendment of the Constitution with reference to woman suffrage it is not my purpose to detain the Senate any longer than to say a word of encouragement to those who have come here with petitions and those whom they represent throughout the length and breadth of the land.

A few days ago the American Senate witnessed a strange spectacle, a spectacle that a few years ago no man in this body would have believed would ever have been witnessed within these walls within his own lifetime. During my own short service in this body I remember a plea I made for the right of the American people to elect their Senators, and it was met with scorn and derision by Members of this body, and one distinguished Senator could show his contempt for the proposition in no other way than by leaving the Chamber. But a few days ago the people of Georgia having elected a Member of this body that Senator was sworn into office, the first in the history of this Republic elected by a vote of the people themselves. And I want to say to the women who have come to Washington with these petitions, and through them and through this occasion to the women of America, that it took the men of America almost a century and a quarter to get the right to elect an American Senator.

But, Mr. President, there is a law of human nature in free government that is as resistless as the law under which the tide ebbs and flows. That law, briefly stated, is that if you give man the right to participate at all in free government you may throw around him every check which human ingenuity can conceive and it will prove fruitless, for he will burn away those checks and balances and will reduce free government to its last analysis, which is a government by the people. He will sooner or later bring himself directly in touch with the election of every officer connected with the government, and he will at the same time develop those instrumentalities of government which will make those to whom authority is temporarily and for the time being delegated servants and not masters of the people, who create the office and select the representative.

With that law in view and with the experience of the American people in finally effectuating the direct election of American Senators, I want to say to the womanhood of America that whatever the fate of this joint resolution may be, whatever the fate of this present movement may be, by that resistless law which I have referred to the time is not far distant, the time is inevitable, when the American people will confer upon American womanhood the only peaceable weapon known to free government for her own protection, for the protection of her property and the protection of her children, and that is the ballot.

Mr. President, on behalf of the women of Minnesota I take pleasure in presenting these petitions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, it was my pleasure and privilege with a number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to go to Hyattsville this morning to meet the ladies who are the representatives of the several States with petitions asking for the support of Congress to Senate joint resolution No. 1.

This is one of the progressive movements of the age, Mr. President. I know that in days gone by the man who advocated woman suffrage was looked down upon in the community in which he lived just as the man who advocated the direct election of Senators by the people was looked upon as a man "fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils." But a movement which had for its purpose the direct election of Senators by the people has become a fixity in a law of Congress. So the movement now which has for its purpose the enfranchisement of woman, although in some sections of our country it is bitterly opposed, will eventually become a part of national law just as it has become a part of the law of several of the States.

It is a movement which is absolutely certain of accomplishment, Mr. President, because it is right. There is no reason in the world why the women of this country should not be permitted to exercise the right of suffrage. They are the equals of men in all that goes for the making of a better State, and they are the superiors of men in all that goes to make for a higher and loftier citizenship.

It can be safely said that in every State of the Union where a great moral question is involved and where the women have the right to exercise the privilege of voting, the woman is found also on the right side, because her heart is in the home, her home is her shrine, and she strives rather for those things which will be better for the home life than for those things which may be best for the building up of a political party.

I take great pleasure, Mr. President, in presenting petitions from the people of my State, which has only recently, after a battle of 30 years, enfranchised the women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to add my tribute to the eulogy that has been pronounced upon the women of the country by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] and to state my approval of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Early in Kansas there was extended to the women the privilege of voting in the election of school officers and in the control of school affairs. Shortly after I made that State my home I attended a meeting for the election of school officers. I observed the farmers coming in from over the country with their wives to attend the meeting and elect the officers who would control the affairs of the schools for the coming year. It was an election carried on in the most orderly and creditable manner. That was my first observation as to the operation of woman suffrage, and I thought then that such a policy was a very fitting thing.

Later in our State there was extended to the women the privilege of voting in municipal affairs. That movement was resisted with great determination by the evil influences of society, and similar arguments to those that have been made against the present movement for woman's enfranchisement were made against the proposition to give them the right of suffrage in municipal elections. But the right was conferred, and the result has been a better condition in every town in Kansas than that which existed before this right was conferred.

The influence of the women in the municipal elections of Kansas has been for the betterment of moral conditions as well as business conditions in that State. It has made the polling place a more respectable place than it was before it was visited by their refining presence, and it has added to the intellectual as well as the moral uplifting of the municipalities of our State.

After a struggle of 20 years and more, the friends of woman suffrage succeeded last year in conferring the right of suffrage universally in our State, and, judging from the experience of the past, I know that it will have the same beneficial influence in State affairs that it had in our school affairs and in our municipal affairs.

The State that withholds the right from its women of participating in the affairs of its government is doing itself an injustice, because their participation in the affairs of the State will benefit every Commonwealth that enjoys that privilege. It has been my great pleasure to campaign the States where woman suffrage has been extended, and I observed in the audiences larger numbers of women than in the audiences where the right of suffrage had not been extended; and for intelligent understanding of intricate economic questions they are the equals of men. You will find a larger percentage of women in your audiences in a State where suffrage is enjoyed by them who understand and are informed in regard to the political and complex problems that confront our civilization than you will find in men. I have no patience with the argument that they have not the capacity to deal with questions relating to governmental affairs.